U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Technical Information Service

PB-295 496

Attitudes Toward Environmental Quality Area, Ethnicity and SES

Pan American Univ, Edinburg, TX

Prepared for

Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC Office of Monitoring and Technical Support

Feb 79

United States
Environmental Protection
Agency

Office of Monitoring and Technical
Support
Washington DC 20460

EPA-600/5-79-004
February 1979

Research and Development

PB 295496

EPA

Attitudes Toward Environmental Quality

Area, Ethnicity and SES

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

RESEARCH REPORTING SERIES

Research reports of the Office of Research and Development, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, have been grouped into nine series. These nine broad categories were established to facilitate further development and application of environmental technology. Elimination of traditional grouping was consciously planned to foster technology transfer and a maximum interface in related fields. The nine series are:

1. Environmental Health Effects Research
2. Environmental Protection Technology
3. Ecological Research
4. Environmental Monitoring
5. Socioeconomic Environmental Studies
6. Scientific and Technical Assessment Reports (STAR)
7. Interagency Energy-Environment Research and Development
8. "Special" Reports
9. Miscellaneous Reports

This report has been assigned to the SOCIOECONOMIC ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES series. This series includes research on environmental management, economic analysis, ecological impacts, comprehensive planning and forecasting, and analysis methodologies. Included are tools for determining varying impacts of alternative policies; analyses of environmental planning techniques at the regional, state, and local levels; and approaches to measuring environmental quality perceptions, as well as analysis of ecological and economic impacts of environmental protection measures. Such topics as urban form, industrial mix, growth policies, control, and organizational structure are discussed in terms of optimal environmental performance. These interdisciplinary studies and systems analyses are presented in forms varying from quantitative relational analyses to management and policy-oriented reports.

This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161.

TECHNICAL REPORT DATA
(Please read Instructions on the reverse before completing)

1. REPORT NO.	2.	3. RECIPIENT'S ACCESSION NO.
EPA-600/5-79-004		PB295496

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE	5. REPORT DATE
ATTITUDES TOWARD ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY: AREA, ETHNICITY AND SES	February 1979 issuing date
	6. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION CODE
7. AUTHOR(S)	8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NO.
Jerry L. Polinard	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.
Pan American University Edinburg, Texas 78539	1RW103
	11. CONTRACT/GRANT NO.
	68-01-2683
12. SPONSORING AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS	13. TYPE OF REPORT AND PERIOD COVERED
Office of Monitoring and Technical Support Office of Research and Development U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Washington, D.C. 20460	Final
	14. SPONSORING AGENCY CODE
	EPA/600/19

15. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

16. ABSTRACT

In a study of the San Antonio, Texas, SMSA, this report indicates that, while respondents believe the environment is deteriorating, they do not believe environmental problems are among the most important faced by the Nation. Analysis of the data shows that:

1) there is a significant relationship between environmental attitude and area, ethnicity and SES;

2) concern with environmental quality and problems is greater among inner-city respondents than suburban respondents;

3) Mexican-Americans rank environmental concerns higher than Anglos no matter where they live although Anglos are more aware of and active in organizations that focus on the environment; and

4) high SES respondents were more aware of environmental problems and more actively involved in environmental organizations than middle or low SES respondents.

17. KEY WORDS AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

a. DESCRIPTORS	b. IDENTIFIERS/OPEN ENDED TERMS	c. COSATI Field/Group
Pollution Attitudes	Environmental Surveys	05A 13B

18. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT	19. SECURITY CLASS *(This Report)*	21. NO. OF PAGES
Release to public Unlimited	Unclassified	129
	20. SECURITY CLASS *(This page)*	22. PRICE
	Unclassified	PC-F/07MF-F01

EPA Form 2220-1 (Rev. 4-77)

☆ U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1979 — 657-060/1619

EPA-600/5-79-004
February 1979

ATTITUDES TOWARD ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY: AREA, ETHNICITY AND SES

by

Jerry L. Polinard
Pan American University
Edinburg, Texas 78539

Contract No. 68-01-2683

Project Officer

Clyde C. Bishop, Jr.
Technical Support Division
Office of Monitoring and Technical Support
Washington, D.C. 20460

OFFICE OF MONITORING AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

DISCLAIMER

This report has been reviewed by the Office of Research and Development, Minority Institutions Research Support, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and approved for publication. Approval does not signify that the contents necessarily reflect the views and policies of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

FOREWORD

The U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has the immense task of defining, evaluating, promulgating, regulating, educating and coercing activities which have a positive effect on environmental quality. The social and economic impacts of environmental decisions in the above categories can have a wide range of effects on human life and life-styles. The staggering costs of corrective action to Governments and industries could force a shift in policy toward educating and coercing people to lend a greater hand in developing and implementing abatement programs.

In order to develop effective abatement programs, the EPA must have a base of information on the attitudes, preceptions and willingness of the populace to cooperate. This report presents quantitative data on these variables and shows the stratification of each variable in a range of economic and social settings in the inner-city, suburban, and rural societies.

A. C. Trakowski
Deputy Assistant Administrator
for Monitoring and Technical Support

ABSTRACT

Americans are less than three generations removed from an era when virgin land, clean water, pure air and quiet neighborhood were an integral part of the nation's life style. This era, however, has passed. A host of problems, including overcrowding, unclean air, impure water and high noise levels, has formed what is known as "the environmental crisis."

In confronting this crisis our government is faced with different options. And, as the nature of our political system is such that public attitude are important influences on policy outputs, indeed, that public policy is expected to reflect public values, it is essential that the environmental attitude of the American public be known. This study focuses on the environmental attitudes of residents in the San Antonio SMSA.

The data indicate that, while the respondents believe the environment is deteriorating, they do not believe environmental problems are among the most important faced by the nation. We found also that our respondents view the environment in both physical and social terms. Respondents believe television, from which they derive most of their information relating to environmental problems, is the most accurate source of information (with radio a distant second source).

We found significant relationships between environmental attitude and area, ethnicity and SES. Our data indicate that concern with environmental problems decrease as one moves away from the center city to the rural area. Suburban respondents are more optimistic about current and future environmental conditions than respondents living in the center city or rural areas.

Mexican-Americans rank environmental concerns higher than Anglos. Anglos, although more optimistic about environmental conditions, are much more aware of and active in organizations (both public and private) which focus on the environment.

High SES respondents were more aware of environmental problems and more actively involved in environmental organizations than low or middle SES respondents.

This report was submitted in fulfillment of Contract No. 68-01-2683 by Pan American University under the sponsorship of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. This report covers the period September 1974 to September 1977, and work was completed as of May 16, 1978.

CONTENTS

Foreword iii

Abstract iv

Tables vi

1. Introduction 1

2. Purpose, Scope and Methodology 4

3. Frequencies 6

4. Area Responses to Environmental Problems 29

5. Ethnicity and the Environment 48

6. SES 66

7. Media Influence 86

8. Multivariate Analysis 107

9. Conclusions 112

Bibliography 115

TABLES

Number		Page
1	Most Important Problems	11
2	Definition of Environment	12
3	Perception of Present Environment	13
4	Perception of Past Environment	14
5	Perception of Future Environment	15
6	Contributors to Environmental Problems	16
7	National Media Use	17
8	State Media Use	18
9	Local Media Use	19
10	Media Accuracy	20
11	Read Story on Environment	21
12	Saw TV Report on Environment	22
13	Life Styles and Environmental Problems	23
14	Knowledge of Governmental Environmental Agencies	24
15	Knowledge of Civic Environmental Agencies	25
16	Membership in Environmental Group	26
17	Contacts With Public Officials	27
18	Attendance at Environmental Meetings	28
19	Important Problems By Area	33
20	Definition of Environment By Area	34

Number		Page
21	Perception of Present Environment By Area	35
22	Perception of Future Environment By Area	36
23	Contributors to Environmental Problems By Area	37
24	Life Styles and Environmental Problems By Area	38
25	Allocation of Money to Auto Exhaust By Area	39
26	Allocation of Money to Water Pollution By Area	40
27	Allocation of Money to Noise Pollution By Area	41
28	Allocation of Money to Trash Pollution By Area	42
29	Allocation of Money to Recreation By Area	43
30	Knowledge of Governmental Environmental Agencies By Area	44
31	Knowledge of Civic Environmental Agencies By Area	45
32	Membership in Environmental Group By Area	46
33	Contacts With Public Officials By Area	47
34	Most Important Problems By Ethnic Group	51
35	Definition of Environment By Ethnicity	52
36	Perception of Present Environment By Ethnicity	53
37	Perception of Future Environment By Ethnicity	54
38	Contributors to Environmental Problems By Ethnicity	55
39	Allocation of Money to Auto Exhaust By Ethnicity	56
40	Allocation of Money to Water Pollution By Ethnicity	57
41	Allocation of Money to Noise Pollution By Ethnicity	58
42	Allocation of Money to Trash Pollution By Ethnicity	59
43	Allocation of Money to Recreation By Ethnicity	60
44	Life Styles and Environmental Problems By Ethnicity	61
45	Knowledge of Governmental Environmental Agencies By Ethnicity	62

Number		Page
46	Knowledge of Civic Environmental Agencies By Ethnicity.	63
47	Membership in Environmental Group By Ethnicity.	64
48	Contacts With Public Officials By Ethnicity	65
49	Most Important Problems By SES.	70
50	Definition of Environment By SES.	71
51	Perception of Present Environment By SES.	72
52	Perception of Future Environment By SES	73
53	Contributors to Environmental Problems By SES	74
54	Life Styles and Environmental Problems By SES	75
55	Allocation of Money to Auto Exhaust By SES.	76
56	Allocation of Money to Water Pollution By SES	77
57	Allocation of Money to Noise Pollution By SES	78
58	Allocation of Money to Trash Pollution By SES	79
59	Allocation of Money to Recreation By SES.	80
60	Knowledge of Governmental Environmental Agencies By SES	81
61	Knowledge of Civic Environmental Agencies By SES.	82
62	Membership in Environmental Group By SES.	83
63	Contacts With Public Officials By SES	84
64	Attendance at Environmental Meetings By SES	85
65	National Media Use By Area.	89
66	State Media Use By Area	90
67	Local Media Use By Area	91
68	National Media Use By Ethnicity	92
69	State Media Use By Ethnicity.	93
70	Local Media Use By Ethnicity.	94

Number		Page
71	National Media Use By SES	95
72	State Media Use By SES.	96
73	Local Media Use By SES.	97
74	Media Accuracy By Area.	98
75	Media Accuracy By Ethnicity	99
76	Media Accuracy By SES	100
77	Read Environmental Story By Area.	101
78	Saw TV Environmental Report By Area	102
79	Read Environmental Story By Ethnicity	103
80	Saw TV Environmental Report By Ethnicity.	104
81	Read Environmental Story By SES	105
82	Saw TV Environmental Report By SES.	106
83	Summary Table: Results From Multiple Regression.	110
84	Summary Table: Results From Factor Analysis.	111

SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION

Americans are less than three generations removed from an era when virgin land, clean water, pure air and quiet neighborhoods were an integral part of the nation's life style. The nearness of this historical link explains, in part, America's surprise at the recent emergence of environmental quality as one of its most viable domestic concerns (in January, 1971, Time magazine identified the environment as "the issue of the year").

A host of problems, including overcrowding, unclean air, impure water and high noise levels, has formed what is known as "the environmental crisis." The energy crisis of 1974-75 added the element of scarcity to the expanding list of environmental problems.

In response to this crisis something nebulously called "the environment movement" has developed. Americans have begun seriously evaluating their role in the human environment system, defined by the Council of Environmental Quality as including not only "the earth, its surrounding envelope of life-giving water and air...," but also the public's interaction with its natural and artificial surroundings.

The present environmental "movement" is not the first time Americans have evidenced awareness of their ecology. In the 19th Century legislation existed which prohibited the polluting of water and required forms of land use (see, for instance, Euclid v. Amber Reality Co., 272 U.S. 365 (1926), for a concise history of early land use legislation). Additional legislation relating to air and water pollution appeared more than a generation ago.

Most of this early legislation, however, while recognizing in minor ways a need to protect the human environment, was predicated on the traditional values of the period in which the legislation was passed. These beliefs included the sanctity of property rights, the non-interference of government in the economy and the pursuance of economic success, even at the expense of environmental destruction. The Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, for example, prohibited throwing refuse into any navigable waterway of the United States. The prupose of the Act, however, was not to provide clean water, but rather to eliminate potential shipping hazards.

To be sure, these values still are evident today. However, the contemporary environmental movement has taken a different tack. The present orientation is more toward social, rather than economic needs. The writings of Rachael Carson, Lewis Mumford and William Douglas have focused on the relationship of environmental factors to the quality of life, and this focus was

embraced by the activists of the 1960's.

Nonetheless, the energy crisis of the 1970's has demonstrated clearly that the environmental system cannot be divorced from either social and/or economic considerations. The public must consider what qualitative and monetary tradeoffs they are willing to make for environmental improvement. They must strive for a balance between a qualitative environment and a viable economy.

And, as the nature of our political system is such that public attitudes are important influences on policy outputs, that public policy indeed is expected to reflect public values, it is essential that the environmental attitudes of the American public be known.

This study hopes to contribute to this knowledge.

American attitudes toward the environment already have been the subject of much inquiry. Many public and private surveys have added to our knowledge of how America is reacting to environment problems. In general, surveys have shown:

1. Between 1965 and 1970 the percentage of Americans who identified our pollution among the three major public problems increased 300 percent. No other issue about which the public was polled evidenced such growth in recognition;

2. After 1970 the public response to environmental problems began to be tempered with an increased awareness of the potential economic costs of resolving these problems;

3. Americans believe the environment is continuing to deteriorate;

4. Americans believe our problems are more or as important as welfare, national spending and taxes, but less important than inflation, national security and corruption in government;

5. Although few Americans are willing to pay the necessary "personal costs" to achieve economic goals, they do believe the current public expenditures should not be decreased;

6. Americans view environmental problems primarily in terms of water and air pollution;

7. Communities characterized by higher income and education levels are more sensitive to environmental problems and are more willing to act, or support action, to improve environmental conditions;

8. Most Americans rely on television and radio for information relating to environmental quality.

This knowledge is important. It not only informs us, but also aids public agencies in their efforts to address the problems of environmental

quality. The most important public agency in the development of our national environmental policy is the United States Environmental Protection Agency. The EPA needs to know what, why and how the public perceives environmental problems if it is to execute its tasks effectively.

If the EPA is to control the cause and effects of environmental problems, if it is to establish national standards relating to the use of the environment, and if it is to enforce these actions it must know what the public thinks.

Public opinion is not static; it is continually in a state of flux. That is why we need to continually ascertain the public attitudes toward the environment. We need to ascertain what relationship, if any, the public's awareness of environmental conditions has with respect to its awareness of other problems, e.g., inflation, unemployment, taxes. We need to know at any given time what cost trade-offs the public is willing to accept in return for environmental improvement.

We need to know also how the public perceives the environment itself and how this perception relates to individual lifestyles. We need to ascertain the influence of the news media on the formation of environmental attitudes, and which specific area of the media has the most significant impact.

The diversity of the American public has important consequences for agencies involved in developing public policy. People living in the same area do not necessarily think alike. Therefore, we need to know what effects this diversity has on the public's perception of the environment. Do people living in the same spatial regions, but residing in different spatial units (e.g., inner city, suburbs, rural) perceive their environment and environmental problems differently? What are people willing to "give up" to initiate environmental change, and how does the willingness vary from one segment of the population to another? Are perceptions of the environment affected by ethnicity? By income?

These are the general types of questions which need to be asked about the environment, and this study is directed toward these questions.

The second section of this report explains the purpose, scope and methodology of this study. The third section describes the general frequency of responses to the survey instrument. The fourth section explores the results of the survey as they relate to people living in urban, suburban and rural areas. The fifth section addresses the relationship between SES income and survey responses. The seventh section explores the influence of the media on the respondent's attitudes. The eighth section employes the tools of multivariate analysis to learn in more detail what the survey data tells us. The ninth section offers conclusions and suggestions for further study.

SECTION 2

PURPOSE, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

PURPOSE

This study is designed to add to our knowledge of environmental attitudes and perceptions. The central thrust of this study is to identify and measure those aspects of environmental quality which have a significant impact on respondents selected on the basis of (1) area stratification (i.e., urban, suburban and rural areas), (2) ethnicity (primarily Anglo and Mexican-American), and (3) SES income.

Focusing on these three sub-groups, the central objectives of this study are:

1. To identify and evaluate the extent to which environmental attitude may vary between and among individuals within the related subgroup populations.

2. To identify and evaluate the relationships between environmental problems and non-environmental problems as perceived by these subgroup populations.

3. To identify and evaluate the extent to which individuals within and among the subgroup population are willing to "pay" (in economic and non-economic terms) for improvement in environmental quality.

4. To identify and evaluate the media influences which have the most significant impact in shaping the environmental attitudes of respondents.

5. To correlate these findings with existing empirical data.

Several tentative hypotheses suggest themselves as guidelines for our inquiry:

1. Affluence and education will be in direct relationship to one's awareness of environmental problems. That is, the higher one's income and more extensive one's education, the more likely one is to be aware of and sensitive to the environmental system.

2. Individuals residing in a deteriorating environment are more likely to be aware of environmental problems than those residing in a

healthy environment. Note that this hypothesis may be incompatible with the first.

3. Individuals with a greater awareness of the environmental system will manifest also a greater awareness of the relationship of the environmental system to all facets of life styles.

4. Individuals with a greater awareness of the environmental system will be more willing to accept the "costs" of improving that system.

SCOPE

The regional scope of this study is the San Antonio, Texas SMSA, which includes a population of almost one million people. These people reside in defined urban, suburban and rural units. The population is also clearly stratified by ethnicity with a large Mexican-American population (38%).

METHODOLOGY

The methodology utilized in this study is survey research. An interview schedule of forty-two questions was administered to 1088 people from an initial sample design of 1650. The design was developed by drawing cluster samples using block statistics. The clusters were composed of three housing units, randomly selected from the 260,925 housing units in the SMSA. Within each housing unit, one adult, also randomly selected through a respondent selective randoming device, was scheduled to be interviewed. Five hundred and fifty area cluster samples were used. The total number of housing units divided by 550 resulted in the figure 474. Therefore, starting with a randomly-selected housing unit, every 474th housing unit and the housing unit on each side were selected for interviews.

Callbacks were made three times before a substitution housing unit or respondent was selected. When substitutions were made, the data from these interviews was collected and correlated with non-substitution results to ascertain if significant differences existed. Similarily, at the end of the survey, a sample of respondents who had refused earlier interviews was drawn. These respondents were contacted again and the data collected to ascertain if there were significant differences between those who refused and the regular data.

The survey instrument was administered in both English and Spanish. The interviewing was conducted by students of Pan American University (the contractor). The students were trained in three separate sessions and performed well in the field. Quality control checks were conducted during the interviewing periods.

The sample thus obtained significantly underrepresented the Anglo population of the SMSA. Thus, it was necessary to weight the respondents. The procedure used was the weight procedure of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. The reweighted percentage of Anglos was thus 64% of the sample.

SECTION 3

FREQUENCIES

This section is an overview of the data collected by the study. Such an overview is important to an understanding of the relationships examined in later sections.

It is important to understand the perceived relationship between environmental problems and other public issues. We asked respondents first to identify the various public problems with which they were concerned. Two problem areas were identified most often: economy and crime. The economic area, which included unemployment, was identified by almost half of the respondents as a national problem and by a third as a community problem. Crime and corruption were cited by 16% as a national problem and by 15.5% as a community problem.

Only 2.7% of the respondents identified the environment as a specific national problem, 3.8% agreed it was a local problem, while a slightly higher percentage (7.4%) saw the energy shortage as a national problem (5.6% viewed it as a local problem).

To examine one aspect of the relationship between these problems we asked respondents to rank eight common problems according to which they believed most important, second most important, and third most important. We arranged a scale score on a 5-3-1 basis, 5 points for most important, 3 for second most important, and 1 for third most important.

Table 1 shows that economic problems (i.e., state of the economy and unemployment) and crime and violence are perceived to be the most important problems. If we add energy shortage to environmental problems, there is a significant increase in the importance of the environmental area. However, fewer than three hundred respondents identified the environment as one of the three most important problems.

Most of the respondents, thus, do not see the environment as a major problem facing either the nation or San Antonio.

We were interested in how people defined the term "environment." We asked, "Will you tell me in your own words what the environment means to you?" Their answers were placed in the categories found in Table 2. Over half of the respondents (55.1%) identified the environment as including both physical and social components. The next largest category was "no idea," with 14.8% of the respondents selecting this category. Thirteen and a half

percent of the respondents viewed the environment primarily in physical terms as contrasted with 8.6% who saw it primarily in a social context.

One issue which has been studied frequently concerns the trend of our environment. We asked the respondents to identify the conditions of the present environment, the environment five years earlier and five years into the future. The question: "Here is a ladder. Imagine that the top of the ladder represents the best possible environmental conditions, and the bottom of the ladder represents the worst possible environmental conditions. Where do you think San Antonio stands on the ladder at the present time?" A nine would indicate the best possible conditions; a zero, the worst possible conditions.

Table 3 shows that respondents generally viewed the present environment in positive terms. If we take 0 through 3 to be below average, 4 through 6 to be average, and 7 through 9 to be above average, we find that 40.5% of the respondents identified present environmental conditions as above average, 38% as average and 21.6% as below average. This might, in part, explain the low percentage of responses identifying environmental problems as a major problem (see above, p. 6).

Table 4 looks back to the past and presents a slightly more pessimistic perception. About 40% of the respondents (38.4%) still identified the environment as above average, but now 35.4% see past environmental conditions as below average and 26.4% as average.

Table 5 offers us a picture of the future and a not-very-bright picture at that. About half of the respondents (44.0%) believe the future conditions of the environment will be worse than that of either the present or past. One third believe the environment will improve the next five years and 22.3% believe it will be average.

In order to develop public policy relating to any problem it is most important to identify the source of the problem. We asked the respondents to name what they thought contributed the most to our environmental problems. The question: "Who or what do you feel is contributing most to the environmental problems in this area?"

The contributor identified by the largest single group of respondents (32.4%) was "individual" (see Table 6). However, 22.1% identified no source. Industry, frequently publicized as a major pollutant, was cited by 10.6% and ranked behind government which was singled out by 12.8%.

We were interested in the impact of the media on the public's perception of environmental problems. First, we asked each respondent to identify the media source from which they obtained most of their information about national state and local events. As Tables 7, 8, and 9 indicate, television and newspapers far exceed any other media source in informing the respondents. In each case about one half of the respondents obtained most of the information from TV and 1/4 to 1/5 obtained their information from newspapers. It is interesting to note that the impact of television lessens as one moves from national to state to local news while the impact of radio increases.

We asked the respondents to identify the media source they considered most accurate. The question: "Which of these sources of information do you think is most likely to give you an unbiased and accurate report of news events?" Table 10 shows that 42.5% believed television to be most accurate, followed by newspapers and radio. Fourteen and a half percent contended that none of the media sources were unbiased.

We then asked the respondents if they recalled any recent news coverage of environmental events. Table 11 reports data concerning the newspaper coverage. About half (48.2%) of the respondents recalled reading something in a newspaper relating to the environment (note that 81% of the respondents indicated they continually read a newspaper). Table 12 focused on television coverage. Forty-five and a half percent of the respondents believed they had seen something on TV relating to the environment; 49.8% had not seen anything concerning the environment. Of the 74.1% respondents who listen to a radio, only 23.3% could recall anything recently that commented on the environment. These figures were almost identical to those responding to similar questions concerning magazines. Seventy percent said they read or subscribed to magazines on a regular basis, but only 23.5% recalled any article relating to the environment.

There has been much discussion concerning America's life style and how it contributes to many of our problems. We asked the respondents: "Do you think that the ways that Americans live contributes to environmental problems?"

Table 13 reveals that an overwhelming 67.3% of the respondents did see our life styles as contributing to environmental problems. Only 16.4% categorically rejected such an idea.

The knowledge of how much money the public is willing to spend is of critical importance to public officials. We identified five general areas of environmental problems: auto exhaust, water pollution, noise, garbage and waste disposal, and creating recreational areas. We asked each respondent: "If your total taxes for such items as sales tax, amusement tax, liquor tax and the like were to be increased, say by $100, how much out of this $100 would you be willing to spend for the following: auto exhaust, water pollution, noise, garbage and waste disposal and creating recreational areas to maintain a clear environment?"

The first problem identified was "auto exhaust pollution." About 50% of the respondents (44.0%) were unwilling to spend any of the $100 here. Fifteen and a half percent were willing to contribute $20 and 10.9%, $25. Almost three-fourths (71.1%) of the respondents were unwilling to distribute more than $20.

The second problem was water pollution. Thirty-six point one percent of the respondents did not want any of the money distributed here. Fifteen point three percent agreed to allocate $20 and 12.9%, $25. Ten point two percent agreed to allocate $50. In general the respondents seem to attach more importance to water pollution than to auto exhaust problems.

The third problem concerned "noise." Fifty-eight point nine percent of the respondents refused to allocate any money to this problem. Nine point eight percent were willing to contribute $10 and 12.8%, $20, but with over 75% of the respondents allocating less than $20, noise did not seem to be a major problem.

The fourth area was trash and waste disposal. Here, the respondents seemed more concerned. Still, over one-third (37.5%) allocated no money. Fifteen point two percent were willing to allocate $20 and 12.6%, $25. Ten percent allocated $50.

The final problem area identified concerned recreational areas. This seemed by far to be the category which generated an allocation of money. Only 28.3% refused to distribute any of their money to this problem. Fourteen and a half percent donated $20, 10.6%, $25 and 14.8% spent $50. Less than 40% were unwilling to spend at least $20 on this problem.

With the exception of the latter problem, none of the problems claimed a disproportionate amount of money from the respondents.

Citizen involvement in public policy is very important. We were interested both in the citizens' knowledge of governmental agencies focusing on environmental issues and in their knowledge of and membership in relevant citizen groups or civic agencies.

We asked "Do you happen to know if there are any governmental agencies or organizations in the San Antonio area which are concerned with the protection of the environment?"

Table 14 indicates that 52.5% of the respondents were aware of some governmental agencies concerned with environmental problems. Of these respondents 24.6% could identify the agency, with 6.6% recognizing the EPA as such an agency. Thirty-seven point eight percent of the respondents know of no government agency in the San Antonio area concerned with environmental problems. Only 90 respondents identified the EPA.

We asked also if there were any citizens groups or civic clubs in the San Antonio area that study environmental problems or take stands on environmental problems.

Here we found that more respondents were aware of local, non-governmental agencies than had been aware of governmental agencies. Sixty point four percent of the respondents were aware of such organizations (see Table 15). Of these, 31.5% could identify the local organization by name, with the Sierra Club being most widely recognized (8.2%).

We then asked, "Do you happen to belong to any organization that studies or takes stands on environmental issues?"

"No," was the overwhelming answer. Table 16 indicates that about nine out of ten respondents did not belong to any environmentally-active organization. Of the 9.9% that do belong to an organization, no more than 1.1%

belong to the same organization, indicating that no single environmentally-active organization even remotely has a following in San Antonio.

We sought to identify other indices of environmental activism. We asked, "Have you ever written any letters, telephoned or personally called on anyone concerning environmental issues?"

As might be expected from the answer to the previous question, a significant number of respondents had never utilized any of these approaches. Eighty point four percent had never contacted anyone concerning environmental issues (see Table 17). Of the 17.9% who had made contact, 9.1% had called a public official and 5.6% had written a public official.

Finally, we asked, "Have you ever attended any meetings or rallies to complain or learn about the environmental problems?"

Again, the answers were consistent with responses to previous questions concerning activities. Table 18 indicates that 85.8% of the respondents had never attended a meeting.

A demographic profile of the survey follows. Sixty point three percent of the sample had resided in the San Antonio area five years or more (22.4% had resided in the area for over 15 years). Twenty-six point three percent of the respondents had lived there two years or less. Forty-nine point two percent were employed. Twenty-eight percent of the sample had completed high school, 15.6% had completed college. Nineteen and a half percent had an 8th grade education or less. Virtually all adult age groups were evenly represented with 30-34 year olds comprising the smallest portion of the sample (10%) and 45-54 (16.5%) and 18-24 (16.4%) the largest. Twenty-five point nine percent of the respondents had incomes of $15,000 or more; 45.4% had incomes of less than $10,000. Fifty-eight point three percent of the respondents were female. Sixty-four point one percent of the sample were Anglo and almost one-third were Mexican-American. Sixty point eight percent lived in the center city area, 8.1% in the suburbs and 17.1% in the rural areas.

TABLE 1. MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEMS

PROBLEM	SCORE
Crime and Violence	2848
State of the Economy	2652
Unemployment	2026
Drug Abuse	1594
Energy Shortage	1340
Governmental Conception	1071
Environmental Problems	493
Race Relations	303

Scale Scores were controlled on a 5-3-1 basis: 5 points for most important; 3, second most important; 1, third most important.

TABLE 2. DEFINITION OF ENVIRONMENT

ENVPROB

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	ADJUSTED FREQ (%)	CUM FREQ (%)
PHYSICAL CHAR	1.	185	13.5	15.9	15.9
INC NB CHAR	2.	83	6.1	7.1	23.0
PRIMARILY SOCIAL	3.	118	8.6	12.1	33.1
PHYSICAL AND	4.	755	55.1	64.8	97.9
TIMES WE LIVE IN	5.	24	1.8	2.1	100.0
	0.	1	2.1	MISSING	100.0
NO IDEA	9.	203	14.8	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	1369	100.0	100.0	

MEAN 3.300

VALID CASES 1165 MISSING CASES 274

TABLE 3. PERCEPTION OF PRESENT ENVIRONMENT

ENVNOW

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	ADJUSTED FREQ (%)	CUM FREQ (%)
POOR	1.	38	2.8	3.2	3.2
	2.	10	0.7	0.8	4.1
	3.	62	4.5	5.2	9.3
	4.	90	6.6	7.6	16.9
	5.	257	18.8	21.7	38.6
	6.	173	12.6	14.6	53.3
	7.	209	15.3	17.7	70.9
	8.	228	16.7	19.3	90.2
EXCELLENT	9.	116	8.5	9.8	100.0
	0.	186	13.6	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	1369	100.0	100.0	

MEAN 6.135

VALID CASES 1183 MISSING CASES 186

TABLE 4. PERCEPTION OF PAST ENVIRONMENT

ENV5P

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	ADJUSTED FREQ (%)	CUM FREQ (%)
POOR	1.	25	1.8	2.4	2.4
	2.	31	2.3	3.0	5.5
	3.	85	6.2	8.3	13.7
	4.	94	6.9	9.2	22.9
	5.	146	10.7	14.2	37.1
	6.	120	8.8	11.7	48.8
	7.	135	9.9	13.2	62.0
	8.	215	15.7	21.0	82.9
EXCELLENT	9.	175	12.8	17.1	100.0
	0.	343	25.1	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	1369	100.0	100.0	

MEAN 6.246

VALID CASES 1026 MISSING CASES 343

TABLE 5. PERCEPTION OF FUTURE ENVIRONMENT

ENV5F

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	ADJUSTED FREQ (%)	CUM FREQ (%)
POOR	1.	94	6.9	9.0	9.0
	2.	76	5.6	7.3	16.3
	3.	103	7.5	9.9	26.2
	4.	81	5.9	7.8	34.0
	5.	128	9.3	12.3	46.3
	6.	97	7.1	9.3	55.6
	7.	133	9.7	12.8	68.4
	8.	195	14.2	18.7	87.1
EXCELLENT	9.	134	9.8	12.9	100.0
	0.	328	24.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	1369	100.0	100.0	

MEAN 5.570

VALID CASES 1041 MISSING CASES 328

TABLE 6. CONTRIBUTORS TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS

MSTCONT

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	ADJUSTED FREQ (%)	CUM FREQ (%)
	0.	92	6.7	6.7	6.7
INDUSTRY	1.	145	10.6	10.6	17.3
INDIVIDUALS	2.	443	32.4	32.4	49.7
GOVT	3.	175	12.8	12.8	62.5
TRAFFIC	4.	110	8.0	8.0	70.5
NONE	5.	45	3.3	3.3	73.8
DRUGS	6.	34	2.5	2.5	76.3
CORRUPTION	7.	15	1.1	1.1	77.4
TOO MANY ANIMALS	8.	8	0.6	0.6	77.9
NO RESPONSE	9.	302	22.1	22.1	100.0
	TOTAL	1369	100.0	122.0	

MEAN 3,880

VALID CASES 1369 MISSING CASES 0

TABLE 7. NATIONAL MEDIA USE

NTLMEDIA

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	ADJUSTED FREQ (%)	CUM FREQ (%)
NEWSPAPERS	1.	284	20.7	21.6	21.6
MAGAZINES	2.	58	4.2	4.4	26.0
RADIO	3.	106	7.7	8.1	34.0
TELEVISION	4.	714	52.2	54.3	88.3
FRIENDS	5.	13	0.9	1.0	89.3
OTHER	6.	10	0.7	0.8	90.0
RADIO AND TV	7.	21	1.5	1.6	91.6
NEWSPAPER & TV	8.	85	6.2	6.5	98.1
NO RESPONSE	9.	25	1.8	1.9	100.0
	0.	53	3.9	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	1369	100.0	100.0	

MEAN 3.618

VALID CASES 1316 MISSING CASES 53

TABLE 8. STATE MEDIA USE

SMEDIA

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	ADJUSTED FREQ (%)	CUM FREQ (%)
NEWSPAPERS	1.	396	28.9	29.7	29.7
MAGAZINES	2.	20	1.5	1.5	31.2
RADIO	3.	121	8.8	9.1	40.3
TELEVISION	4.	625	45.7	46.9	87.2
FRIENDS	5.	15	1.1	1.1	88.3
OTHER	6.	12	0.9	0.9	89.2
RADIO AND TV	7.	25	1.8	1.9	91.1
NEWSPAPER & TV	8.	89	6.5	6.7	97.7
NO RESPONSE	9.	30	2.2	2.3	100.0
	0.	36	2.6	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	1369	100.0	100.0	

MEAN 3.453

VALID CASES 1333 MISSING CASES 36

TABLE 9. LOCAL MEDIA USE

LMEDIA

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	ADJUSTED FREQ (%)	CUM FREQ (%)
NEWSPAPERS	1.	398	29.1	29.9	29.9
MAGAZINES	2.	8	0.6	0.6	30.5
RADIO	3.	151	11.0	11.3	41.8
TELEVISION	4.	583	42.6	43.8	85.6
FRIENDS	5.	38	2.8	2.9	88.5
OTHER	6.	10	0.7	0.8	89.3
RADIO AND TV	7.	23	1.7	1.7	91.0
NEWSPAPER & TV	8.	95	6.9	7.1	98.1
NO RESPONSE	9.	25	1.8	1.9	100.0
	0.	38	2.8	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	1369	100.0	100.0	

MEAN 3.452

VALID CASES 1331 MISSING CASES 38

TABLE 10. MEDIA ACCURACY

ACCINFO

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	ADJUSTED FREQ (%)	CUM FREQ (%)
NEWSPAPERS	1.	278	20.3	20.3	20.3
MAGAZINES	2.	97	7.1	7.1	27.4
RADIO	3.	144	10.5	10.5	38.0
TV	4.	582	42.5	42.6	80.5
OTHER	5.	20	1.5	1.5	82.0
NONE	6.	199	14.5	14.6	96.6
NEWSPAPER&TV	7.	3	0.2	0.2	96.8
NO RESPONSE	9.	44	3.2	3.2	100.0
	0.	2	0.1	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	1369	100.0	100.0	

MEAN 3.616

VALID CASES 1367 MISSING CASES 2

TABLE 11. READ STORY ON ENVIRONMENT

READST

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	ADJUSTED FREQ (%)	CUM FREQ (%)
READ-TAKES PAPER	1.	545	39.8	39.9	39.9
READ-DOESN'T TAKE	2.	115	8.4	8.4	48.3
TAKES-DIDN'T READ	3.	447	32.7	32.7	81.0
DNT-DID NOT READ	4.	239	17.5	17.5	98.5
NO RESP	9.	21	1.5	1.5	100.0
	0.	2	0.1	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	1369	100.0	100.0	

MEAN 2.386

VALID CASES 1367 MISSING CASES 2

TABLE 12. SAW TV REPORT ON ENVIRONMENT

TVSTO

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	ADJUSTED FREQ (%)	CUM FREQ (%)
SAW STORY	1.	623	45.5	45.6	45.6
DIDN'T SEE	2.	682	49.8	49.9	95.5
	3.	36	2.6	2.6	98.1
	4.	1	0.1	0.1	98.2
NO RESP	9.	25	1.8	1.8	100.0
	0.	2	0.1	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	1369	100.0	100.0	

MEAN 1.700

VALID CASES 1367 MISSING CASES 2

TABLE 13. LIFE STYLES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS

LIVECNT

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	ADJUSTED FREQ (%)	CUM FREQ (%)
YES	1.	922	67.3	67.6	67.6
NO	2.	224	16.4	16.4	84.1
BOTH	3.	87	6.4	6.4	90.5
	4.	2	0.1	0.1	90.6
	5.	1	0.1	0.1	90.7
NO RESPONSE	9.	127	9.3	9.3	100.0
	0.	6	0.4	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	1369	100.0	100.0	

MEAN 2.045

VALID CASES 1363 MISSING CASES 6

TABLE 14. KNOWLEDGE OF GOVERNMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCIES

KNGAGN

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	ADJUSTED FREQ (%)	CUM FREQ (%)
YES-IDENTIFY	1.	337	24.6	24.7	24.7
YES-CAN'T ID	2.	382	27.9	28.0	52.6
NO	3.	518	37.8	37.9	90.6
NOT SURE	4.	113	8.3	8.3	98.8
	5.	2	0.1	0.1	99.0
	7.	1	0.1	0.1	99.0
NO RESPONSE	9.	13	0.9	1.0	100.0
	0.	3	0.2	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	1369	100.0	100.0	

MEAN 2.373

VALID CASES 1366 MISSING CASES 3

TABLE 15. KNOWLEDGE OF CIVIC ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCIES

CIVIC

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	ADJUSTED FREQ (%)	CUM FREQ (%)
YES-ID	1.	431	31.5	31.6	31.6
YES-CAN'T ID	2.	395	28.9	29.0	60.6
NO	3.	411	30.0	30.1	90.7
NOT SURE	4.	114	8.3	8.4	99.0
NO RESPONSE	9.	13	0.9	1.0	100.0
	0.	5	0.4	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	1369	100.0	100.0	

MEAN 2.219

VALID CASES 1364 MISSING CASES 5

TABLE 16. MEMBERSHIP IN ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP

MEMORG

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	ADJUSTED FREQ (%)	CUM FREQ (%)
	0.	6	0.4	0.4	0.4
YES	1.	136	9.9	9.9	10.4
NO	2.	1216	88.8	88.8	99.2
NO RESPONSE	3.	3	0.2	0.2	99.4
	9.	8	0.6	0.6	100.0
	TOTAL	1369	100.0	100.0	

MEAN 1.935

VALID CASES 1369 MISSING CASES 0

TABLE 17. CONTACTS WITH PUBLIC OFFICIALS

CONTOFF

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	ADJUSTED FREQ (%)	CUM FREQ (%)
YES-CALL OFF	1.	124	9.1	9.1	9.1
YES-WROTE OFF	2.	76	5.6	5.6	14.6
YES-VISIT OFF	3.	28	2.0	2.0	16.7
YES -CALL NP	4.	7	0.5	2.5	17.2
YES-WROTE NP	5.	10	0.7	2.7	17.9
NO	7.	1101	80.4	82.5	98.5
	8.	2	0.1	2.1	98.6
NO RESPONSE	9.	19	1.4	1.4	100.0
	0.	2	0.1	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	1369	100.0	102.0	

MEAN 6.095

VALID CASES 1367 MISSING CASES 2

TABLE 18. ATTENDANCE AT ENVIRONMENTAL MEETINGS

ATTMEET

CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	ADJUSTED FREQ (%)	CUM FREQ (%)
YES	1.	180	13.1	13.2	13.2
NO	2.	1174	85.8	85.9	99.1
	4.	1	0.1	0.1	99.2
NO RESPONSE	9.	11	0.8	0.8	100.0
	0.	3	0.2	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	1369	100.0	100.2	

MEAN 1.926

VALID CASES 1366 MISSING CASES 3

SECTION 4

AREA RESPONSES TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS

The San Antonio SMSA was selected as the geographical focus for the survey because it offered the opportunity to stratify our sample along rural, suburban and center city lines. It has been suggested in other studies that individuals residing in a deteriorating environment are more likely to be aware of environmental problems than those residing in a healthy environment. Or, more generally, that where one lives can directly affect one's perception of environmental problems. This section looks at the responses stratified according to area.

Does area affect the perception respondents have concerning the importance of public problems? Table 19 shows a significant relationship between the area in which respondents live and their ranking of public problems. Center city residents placed much emphasis on problems relating to the economy (26.7%) and crimes (16.0%). Twenty-three point seven percent of the suburban residents also cited the economy as the most important problem, but 21.6% were unsure and cited no problem as most important. Rural respondents were more concerned about the economy than their two counterparts (41.1% of the rural respondents named the economy) and 14.4% identified crime as the most important.

Thus, the state of the economy is the most important problem named by all three groups, but in different proportions. Center city and rural residents find crime to be a significant problem while suburban residents evidence more uncertainty than the other two areas.

None of the three groups identified "environmental problems" to a significant degree. Four point nine percent of the center city residents, 4.1% of the suburban residents and 4.0% of the rural residents mentioned the environment by name. If we combine environmental problems with energy and refuse, however, the significance is much higher. Twenty-one point three percent of the center city residents, 22.6% of the suburban residents and 20.8% of the rural respondents cite these three areas as most important.

There is a significant relationship between area and the definition of "environment." All three areas agreed that the environment should be defined in terms of both physical and social characteristics (see Table 20). Sixty point three percent of the center city respondents, 74% of the suburban respondents and 66.1% of the rural respondents viewed the environment in this dual manner. The data also indicate that center city and suburban residents are more likely than their rural counterparts to see the environment in primarily physical terms.

We also attempted to identify what trends, if any, the respondents anticipated in the area of environmental improvement. We asked them to establish, on a scale of one to nine, with higher numbers reflecting a better environment, what conditions they believed the environment to be in today, and what condition they anticipated five years hence. One through three would be below average, four through six, average, and seven through nine, above average.

There is a significant relationship between area and respondents' perception of present and future environmental conditions. Table 21 shows that suburban residents see present environmental conditions as better than either center city or rural respondents. Fifty-eight point three percent of the suburban respondents ranked the present environment as above average and 37.8% saw it as average. Only 3.9% labeled it below average. Center city residents believed present conditions were average or above average with 9.4% choosing below average. Rural residents, however, were not so pleased. Twelve and a half percent saw the present environment as below average and not quite one third rated it above average.

These relationships remained significant when we asked about environmental conditions five years hence (see Table 22). Over a third of the rural respondents believed the environment would be below average. Center city and suburban residents were less positive than they had been about present conditions. One fourth of the center city residents predicted the environment would be below average in five years. Suburban respondents remained the most optomistic, but three times as many respondents as before now believed the environment would be below average.

We asked the respondents to identify who or what they believed were contributing most to our environmental conditions. Table 23 demonstrates again a distinction based upon geographical stratification. All three areas viewed individuals as contributing most to our environmental problems with 36.0% of the suburban dwellers holding such a viewpoint followed by 34.2% of the rural respondents and 32.0% of those residing in the center city area. The three areas were rarely separated by more than a few percentage points regardless of which contributor they were naming. However 12.4% of the center city did cite industry as contrasted with 7.2% of the suburban residents. As one moved away from the core city, government became more of a contributor.

When asked if the way Americans live contributes to our environmental problems all three areas agreed that it did. However, there is no relationship between area and response. Sixty-four point one percent of the center city respondents agreed that America's life style was a significant factor in our environmental deterioration and 64% and 64.1% of the suburban and rural respondents respectively supported this proposition (see Table 24).

Turning to the key issue of costs, we asked the respondents to distribute the sum of $100 over a group of environmental problems. We placed respondent allocations into four categories: $0, $1-19, $20-49, and $50 plus.

Tables 25 through 29 relate our findings. We found relationships be-

tween response and area in all five problems examined. Suburban and rural residents are more willing than center city residents to allocate money to control auto exhaust. This is somewhat surprising as one might anticipate that the center city area would be most adversely affected by auto exhaust. Still, one-third of the center city respondents and rural respondents and 35.1% of the suburban respondents would spend $20 to $49 on auto exhaust control. About half of the center city respondents, however, would allocate no money to this area.

Suburban residents seemed slightly more concerned with water pollution than the two area counterparts. Forty-five percent would spend $20 to $49 and 18.9% would spend over $50. Center city residents were the least concerned with over one-third unwilling to contribute any money to this area.

Noise caused the least concern among all three groups. No more than 4.5% of any group was willing to contribute $50 or more and over half of the center city and suburban respondents were unwilling to allocate any money. Rural residents evidenced more interest in this area than either other group, but even then, 47.9% would not allocate any money to controlling noise.

Waste disposal was an important concern of the suburban and rural areas, but center city respondents were unwilling to spend $50 or more and 41% would spend $20 to $49. Suburban residents would allocate slightly more money, with 16.2% and 41.4% responding respectively. Over one-third of the center city residents would spend no money here.

The most popular problem was recreation. Twenty-six point nine percent of the rural residents, 26.3% of the center city residents and 18.9% of the suburban residents were willing to commit $50 or more to recreational areas. Over half of the suburban residents (51.4%) would contribute $20 to $49 as would 40.2% of the rural residents and 31.6% of the center city respondents. This was the only category in which no respondent area exceeded 40% in allocating $0 to the problem.

In the area of citizen recognition and citizen participation we found the following results. We asked respondents if they knew of any governmental agencies or organizations in the San Antonio area which was concerned with the protection of the environment. Fifty-six point seven percent of the suburban respondents were aware of such organizations (25.2% of urban could identify the organization(s)). Fifty-three point nine percent of the center city respondents made the same claim (24.8% could identify the organization(s)). However, less than half (47.4%) of the rural respondents indicated such awareness (see Table 30).

When we referred to their knowledge of citizen groups or civic clubs rather than governmental organizations, we did find a relationship between area and response. Table 31 indicates that 65.7% of the suburban respondents, 61.8% of the center city respondents and 60.2% of the rural respondents were aware of such organizations. Suburban residents were least likely to be unable to identify any such organization. The ability to identify specifically the organizations remained at one-third or less for all three

groups of respondents.

When asked which organizations they could identify, few respondents could recall the specific organization. Fifty-four center city, 12 suburban and 8 rural respondents could identify the EPA while 75 center city residents, 9 suburban and 28 rural respondents were able to name COPS.

Asked to identify non-government groups, respondents singled out the Sierra Club. Fifty-six center city, 18 suburban and 9 rural respondents identified the Sierra Club.

When questioned about actual membership in any of these organizations, the respondents reflected no significant relationship based upon where they lived. Table 32 shows that 13.5% of the suburban respondents belong to some environment-oriented organization, 9.9% of the center city residents and 7.7% of the rural respondents.

We examined the activism of our respondents by asking about their contacting public officials and their actual attendance at meetings concerning the environment. As might be expected from the responses to the questions concerning knowledge of and membership in environmental organizations, the level of activism among all these groups was quite low.

Table 33 shows that about 80% of the respondents in the center city, suburban and rural areas have never contacted a public official or a newspaper about environmental issues. Of the few who have made contact, telephoning or writing a public official appears to be the most common method of contact. No distinction along geographical lines is apparent. There is no significant relationship here between area and response.

TABLE 19. IMPORTANT PROBLEMS BY AREA

AREA	COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOTAL PCT	IMPTPBS1 1. CRIME	2. ECONOMY	3. ENERGY CRISIS	4. ENV PROB	5. GOVT	6. CORRUPTION	7. REFUSE	8. NOT SURE	9. NO RESPONSE	ROW TOTAL
0.	COUNT	16	35	13	7	11	0	12	33	8	135
	ROW PCT	11.9	25.9	9.6	5.2	8.1	0.0	8.9	24.4	5.9	11.4
	COL PCT	9.1	10.3	17.8	12.5	19.6	0.0	9.4	16.9	6.1	
	TOTAL PCT	1.4	3.0	1.1	0.6	0.9	0.0	1.0	2.8	0.7	
1. CENTER CITY	COUNT	120	280	39	37	29	22	84	128	97	748
	ROW PCT	16.0	26.7	5.2	4.9	3.9	2.9	11.2	16.0	13.0	63.3
	COL PCT	68.2	58.7	53.4	66.1	51.8	81.5	66.1	61.5	74.0	
	TOTAL PCT	10.2	16.9	3.3	3.1	2.5	1.9	7.1	10.2	8.2	
3. SUBURBAN	COUNT	11	23	10	4	4	3	8	[illegible]	13	97
	ROW PCT	11.3	23.7	10.3	4.1	4.1	3.1	8.2	21.6	13.4	8.2
	COL PCT	6.3	6.7	13.7	7.1	7.1	11.1	6.3	10.8	9.9	
	TOTAL PCT	0.9	1.9	0.8	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.7	1.8	1.1	
4. RURAL	COUNT	29	83	11	8	12	2	23	21	13	202
	ROW PCT	14.4	41.1	5.4	4.0	5.9	1.0	11.4	10.4	6.4	17.1
	COL PCT	16.5	24.3	15.1	14.3	21.4	7.4	18.1	10.8	9.9	
	TOTAL PCT	2.5	7.0	0.9	0.7	1.0	0.2	1.9	1.8	1.1	
COLUMN TOTAL		176	341	73	56	56	27	127	195	131	1182
		14.9	28.8	6.2	4.7	4.7	2.3	10.7	16.5	11.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 56.43948 WITH 24 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0002

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 187

TABLE 20. DEFINITION OF ENVIRONMENT BY AREA

AREA	ENVPROB	1. PHYSICAL CHAR	2. INC NR CHAR	3. PRIMARILY SOCIAL	4. PHYSICAL AND	5. TIMES WE LIVE IN	ROW TOTAL
	2.	12	7	2	115	0	127
		7.9	5.5	1.6	90.6	0.0	10.9
		5.4	8.4	1.7	15.2	0.0	
		0.9	0.6	0.2	9.9	0.0	
CENTER CITY	1.	135	58	74	424	12	703
		19.2	8.3	10.5	60.3	1.7	60.3
		73.0	69.9	62.7	56.2	50.0	
		11.6	5.0	6.4	36.4	1.0	
SUBURBAN	3.	16	1	6	77	4	104
		15.4	1.0	5.8	74.0	3.8	8.9
		8.6	1.2	5.1	10.2	16.7	
		1.4	0.1	0.5	6.6	0.3	
RURAL	4.	14	12	32	121	4	183
		7.7	6.6	17.5	66.1	2.2	15.7
		7.6	14.5	27.1	16.0	16.7	
		1.2	1.0	2.7	10.4	0.3	
	6.	10	10	4	18	4	46
		21.7	21.7	8.7	39.1	8.7	3.9
		5.4	12.0	3.4	2.4	16.7	
		0.9	0.9	0.3	1.5	0.3	
	7.	0	2	0	0	0	2
		0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
		0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	
COLUMN TOTAL		185	83	118	755	24	1165
		15.9	7.1	10.1	64.8	2.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 131.50232 WITH 20 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 284

TABLE 21. PERCEPTION OF PRESENT ENVIRONMENT BY AREA

AREA	ENVNOW	1. POOR	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9. EXCELLENT	ROW TOTAL
1. CENTER CITY	COUNT	21	7	40	57	146	108	128	144	75	726
	ROW %	2.9	1.0	5.5	7.9	20.1	14.9	17.6	19.8	10.3	67.6
	COL %	55.3	70.0	74.1	67.9	62.4	65.9	67.0	72.7	74.3	
	TOTAL %	2.0	0.7	3.7	5.3	13.6	10.1	11.9	13.4	7.0	
3. SUBURBAN	COUNT	3	-	1	2	20	17	17	28	15	103
	ROW %	2.9	0.0	1.0	1.9	19.4	16.5	16.5	27.2	14.6	9.6
	COL %	7.9	0.0	1.9	2.4	8.5	10.4	8.9	14.1	14.9	
	TOTAL %	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.2	1.9	1.6	1.6	2.6	1.4	
4. RURAL	COUNT	13	3	10	23	58	32	37	23	8	207
	ROW %	6.3	1.4	4.8	11.1	28.0	15.5	17.9	11.1	3.9	19.3
	COL %	34.2	30.0	18.5	27.4	24.8	19.5	19.4	11.6	7.9	
	TOTAL %	1.2	0.3	0.9	2.1	5.4	3.0	3.4	2.1	0.7	
6.	COUNT	1	[illegible]	3	2	10	7	9	3	3	38
	ROW %	2.6	0.0	7.9	5.3	26.3	18.4	23.7	7.9	7.9	3.5
	COL %	2.6	0.0	5.6	2.4	4.3	4.3	4.7	1.5	3.0	
	TOTAL %	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.9	0.7	0.8	0.3	0.3	
COLUMN TOTAL		38	10	54	84	234	164	191	198	101	1074
		3.5	0.9	5.0	7.8	21.8	15.3	17.8	18.4	9.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 49.76756 WITH 24 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0015

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 295

TABLE 22. PERCEPTION OF FUTURE ENVIRONMENT BY AREA

AREA	ENV5F	1. POOR	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9. EXCELLENT	ROW TOTAL
CENTER CITY	1. COUNT	53	47	60	50	77	58	79	114	88	626
	ROW %	8.5	7.5	9.6	8.0	12.3	9.3	12.6	18.2	14.1	67.2
	COL %	60.2	69.1	64.5	63.3	64.7	68.2	69.9	68.3	73.9	
	TOTAL %	5.7	5.0	6.4	5.4	8.3	6.2	8.5	12.2	9.5	
SUBURBAN	3. COUNT	5	2	4	7	15	14	6	24	9	86
	ROW %	5.8	2.3	4.7	8.1	17.4	16.3	7.0	27.9	10.5	9.2
	COL %	5.7	2.9	4.3	8.9	12.6	16.5	5.3	14.4	7.6	
	TOTAL %	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.8	1.6	1.5	0.6	2.6	1.0	
RURAL	4. COUNT	25	16	23	16	19	12	27	24	22	184
	ROW %	13.6	8.7	12.5	8.7	10.3	6.5	14.7	13.0	12.0	19.8
	COL %	28.4	23.5	24.7	20.3	16.0	14.1	23.9	14.4	18.5	
	TOTAL %	2.7	1.7	2.5	1.7	2.0	1.3	2.9	2.6	2.4	
	6. COUNT	5	3	6	6	8	1	1	5	0	35
	ROW %	14.3	8.6	17.1	17.1	22.9	2.9	2.9	14.3	0.0	3.8
	COL %	5.7	4.4	6.5	7.6	6.7	1.2	0.9	3.0	0.0	
	TOTAL %	0.5	0.3	0.6	0.6	0.9	0.1	0.1	0.5	0.0	
COLUMN TOTAL		88	68	93	79	119	85	113	167	119	931
		9.5	7.3	10.0	8.5	12.8	9.1	12.1	17.9	12.8	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 49.99868 WITH 24 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0014

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 438

TABLE 23. CONTRIBUTORS TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS BY AREA

MSTCONT

AREA	COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %	INDUSTRY 0.	INDIVIDUALS 1.	GOVT 2.	3.	TRAFFIC 4.	NONE 5.	DRUGS 6.	CORRUPTION 7.	TOO MANY ANIMALS 8.	NO RESPONSE 9.	ROW TOTAL
2.		19	11	42	14	12	5	0	3	0	36	142
		13.4	7.7	29.2	9.9	8.5	3.5	0.0	2.1	0.0	25.8	10.4
		22.7	7.6	9.0	8.0	10.9	11.1	0.0	20.0	0.0	12.6	
		1.4	0.8	2.9	1.0	0.9	0.4	0.0	0.2	0.0	2.6	
1.		48	103	266	99	74	23	22	9	5	103	832
CENTER CITY		5.8	12.4	32.0	11.9	8.9	2.8	2.6	1.1	0.6	22.8	60.8
		52.2	71.0	60.3	56.6	67.3	51.1	64.7	60.0	62.5	68.6	
		3.5	7.5	19.4	7.2	5.4	1.7	1.6	0.7	0.4	13.4	
3.		11	8	48	16	10	8	3	1	0	14	111
SUBURBAN		9.9	7.2	36.0	14.4	9.0	7.2	2.7	0.9	0.0	12.6	8.1
		12.0	5.5	9.0	9.1	9.1	17.8	8.8	6.7	0.0	4.6	
		0.8	0.6	2.9	1.2	0.7	0.6	0.2	0.1	0.0	1.0	
4.		10	22	80	40	9	7	9	1	3	93	234
RURAL		4.3	9.4	34.2	17.1	3.8	3.0	3.8	0.4	1.3	22.6	17.1
		10.9	15.2	18.1	22.9	8.2	15.6	26.5	4.7	37.5	17.5	
		0.7	1.6	5.8	2.9	0.7	0.5	0.7	0.1	0.2	3.9	
6.		4	1	17	6	5	2	0	1	0	12	48
		8.3	2.1	35.4	12.5	10.4	4.2	0.0	2.1	0.0	25.0	3.5
		4.3	0.7	3.8	3.4	4.5	4.4	0.0	6.7	0.0	4.0	
		0.3	0.1	1.2	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.9	
7.		0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.1
		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	
		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	
COLUMN TOTAL		92	145	443	175	110	45	34	15	8	302	1369
		6.7	12.6	32.4	12.8	8.0	3.3	2.5	1.1	0.6	22.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 66.29199 WITH 45 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0141

TABLE 24. LIFE STYLES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS BY AREA

AREA	LIVECNT	0, YES	1, NO	2, BOTH	3,	4,	5,	9, NO RESPONSE	ROW TOTAL
	0, COUNT	0	99	24	9	0	0	10	142
	ROW %	0.0	69.7	16.9	6.3	0.0	0.0	7.0	10.4
	COL %	0.0	10.7	10.7	10.3	0.0	0.0	7.9	
	TOTAL %	0.0	7.2	1.8	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.7	
CENTER CITY	1, COUNT	5	561	129	49	2	0	86	832
	ROW %	0.6	67.4	15.5	5.9	0.2	0.0	10.3	60.8
	COL %	83.3	60.8	57.6	56.3	100.0	0.0	67.7	
	TOTAL %	0.4	41.0	9.4	3.6	0.1	0.0	6.3	
SUBURBAN	3, COUNT	0	71	15	18	0	0	7	111
	ROW %	0.0	64.0	13.5	16.2	0.0	0.0	6.3	8.1
	COL %	0.0	7.7	6.7	20.7	0.0	0.0	5.5	
	TOTAL %	0.0	5.2	1.1	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.5	
RURAL	4, COUNT	1	156	49	11	0	1	22	234
	ROW %	0.4	66.1	20.9	4.7	0.0	0.4	9.4	17.1
	COL %	16.7	16.9	21.9	12.6	0.0	100.0	17.3	
	TOTAL %	0.1	11.4	3.6	0.8	0.0	0.1	1.6	
	6, COUNT	0	30	7	0	0	0	2	48
	ROW %	0.0	81.3	14.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	3.5
	COL %	0.0	4.2	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	
	TOTAL %	0.0	2.8	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	
	7, COUNT	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
	ROW %	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
	COL %	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL %	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	COLUMN TOTAL	6	922	224	87	2	1	127	1369
		0.4	67.3	16.4	6.4	0.1	0.1	9.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 48.52984 WITH 30 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0958

TABLE 25. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO AUTO EXHAUST BY AREA

AREA	AUTOEX	0	1-19	20-49	50+	ROW TOTAL
	COUNT	373	84	280	95	832
1. CENTER CITY	ROW %	44.8	10.1	33.7	11.4	67.8
	COL %	70.8	55.3	69.1	66.4	
	TOTAL %	30.4	6.8	22.8	7.7	
	COUNT	42	18	39	12	111
3. SUBURBAN	ROW %	37.8	16.2	35.1	10.8	9.0
	COL %	8.0	11.8	9.6	8.4	
	TOTAL %	3.4	1.5	3.2	1.0	
	COUNT	88	41	78	27	234
4. RURAL	ROW %	37.6	17.5	33.3	11.5	19.1
	COL %	16.7	27.0	19.3	18.9	
	TOTAL %	7.2	3.3	6.4	2.2	
	COUNT	22	9	8	9	48
6.	ROW %	45.8	18.8	16.7	18.8	3.9
	COL %	4.2	5.9	2.0	6.3	
	TOTAL %	1.8	0.7	0.7	0.7	
	COUNT	2	0	0	0	2
7.	ROW %	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
	COL %	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL %	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	
COLUMN TOTAL		527	152	405	143	1227
		43.0	12.4	33.0	11.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 23.38509 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0246

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 142

TABLE 26. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO WATER POLLUTION BY AREA

AREA	CNTH20 0.	1-19 1.	20-49 2.	50+ 3.	ROW TOTAL
1. CENTER CITY	307	72	311	142	832
	36.9	8.7	37.4	17.1	67.8
	70.3	58.1	67.0	70.3	
	25.0	5.9	25.3	11.6	
3. SUBURBAN	33	7	50	21	111
	29.7	6.3	45.0	18.9	9.0
	7.6	5.6	10.8	10.4	
	2.7	0.6	4.1	1.7	
4. RURAL	73	39	92	30	234
	31.2	16.7	39.3	12.8	19.1
	16.7	31.5	19.8	14.9	
	5.9	3.2	7.5	2.4	
6.	24	6	11	7	48
	50.0	12.5	22.9	14.6	3.9
	5.5	4.8	2.4	3.5	
	2.0	0.5	0.9	0.6	
7.	0	0	0	2	2
	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.2
	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	
COLUMN TOTAL	437	124	464	202	1227
	35.6	10.1	37.8	16.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 36.35796 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0003

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 142

TABLE 27. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO NOISE POLLUTION BY AREA

AREA	RNOISE	0	1-19	20-49	50+	ROW TOTAL
		0.	1.	2.	3.	
CENTER CITY	1.	495	163	149	25	832
		59.5	19.6	17.9	3.0	67.8
		71.1	65.2	62.3	59.5	
		40.3	13.3	12.1	2.0	
SUBURBAN	3.	61	25	20	5	111
		55.0	22.5	18.0	4.5	9.0
		8.8	10.0	8.4	11.9	
		5.0	2.0	1.6	0.4	
RURAL	4.	112	56	60	6	234
		47.9	23.9	25.6	2.6	19.1
		16.1	22.4	25.1	14.3	
		9.1	4.6	4.9	0.5	
	6.	26	6	10	6	48
		54.2	12.5	20.8	12.5	3.9
		3.7	2.4	4.2	14.3	
		2.1	0.5	0.8	0.5	
	7.	2	0	0	0	2
		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
		0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	
COLUMN TOTAL		696	250	239	42	1227
		56.7	20.4	19.5	3.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 28.06756 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0054

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 142

TABLE 28. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO TRASH POLLUTION BY AREA

AREA	TSH	0.	1-19 1.	20-49 2.	50+ 3.	ROW TOTAL
1, CENTER CITY	COUNT	322	108	285	117	832
	ROW %	38.7	13.0	34.3	14.1	67.8
	COL %	72.2	66.3	64.8	65.7	
	TOTAL %	26.2	8.8	23.2	9.5	
3, SUBURBAN	COUNT	32	15	46	18	111
	ROW %	28.8	13.5	41.4	16.2	9.0
	COL %	7.2	9.2	10.5	10.1	
	TOTAL %	2.6	1.2	3.7	1.5	
4, RURAL	COUNT	64	37	96	37	234
	ROW %	27.4	15.8	41.0	15.8	19.1
	COL %	14.3	22.7	21.8	20.8	
	TOTAL %	5.2	3.0	7.8	3.0	
6,	COUNT	26	3	13	6	48
	ROW %	54.2	6.3	27.1	12.5	3.9
	COL %	5.8	1.8	3.0	3.4	
	TOTAL %	2.1	0.2	1.1	0.5	
7,	COUNT	2	0	0	0	2
	ROW %	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
	COL %	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	
	TOTAL %	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	
COLUMN TOTAL		446 36.3	163 13.3	440 35.9	178 14.5	1227 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 23.95618 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0206

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 142

TABLE 29. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO RECREATION BY AREA

AREA	INEWREC	0.	1.	2.	3.	ROW TOTAL
	1.	248	102	263	219	832
CENTER CITY		29.8	12.3	31.6	26.3	67.8
		74.0	72.3	61.3	68.0	
		20.2	8.3	21.4	17.8	
	3.	24	9	57	21	111
SUBURBAN		21.6	8.1	51.4	18.9	9.1
		7.2	6.4	13.3	6.5	
		2.0	0.7	4.6	1.7	
	4.	49	28	94	63	234
RURAL		20.9	12.0	40.2	26.9	19.1
		14.6	19.9	21.9	19.6	
		4.0	2.3	7.7	5.1	
	6.	12	2	15	19	48
		25.0	4.2	31.3	39.6	3.9
		3.6	1.4	3.5	5.9	
		1.0	0.2	1.2	1.5	
	7.	2	0	0	0	2
		100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
		0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	
COLUMN TOTAL		335	141	429	322	1227
		27.3	11.5	35.0	26.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 34.70916 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0005

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 142

TABLE 30. KNOWLEDGE OF GOVERNMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCIES BY AREA

KNGAGN	AREA: CENTER CITY	SUBURBAN	RURAL			ROW TOTAL
1. YES-IDENTIFY	206	28	49	13		296
	69.6	9.5	16.6	4.4		24.2
	24.8	25.2	22.9	27.1		
	16.8	2.3	4.0	1.1		
2. YES-CAN'T ID	241	35	52	15		353
	68.3	9.9	14.6	4.2		28.8
	29.1	31.5	24.5	31.3		
	19.7	2.9	5.1	1.2		
3. NO	317	34	57	20		470
	67.4	7.2	12.1	4.3		38.4
	38.2	30.6	26.5	41.7	100.0	
	25.9	2.8	4.7	1.6		
4. NOT SURE	56	13	23	0		92
	60.9	14.1	25.0	0.0		7.5	
	6.8	11.7	10.8	0.0		
	4.6	1.1	1.9	0.0		
7.	1	0	0	0		1
	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.1
	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0		
	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0		
9. NO RESPONSE	6	1	3	0		10
	60.0	10.0	30.0	0.0		1.0
	1.0	0.9	1.4	0.0		
	0.7	0.1	0.2	0.0		
COLUMN TOTAL	829	111	214	48		1224
	67.7	9.1	17.5	3.9		100.0

CHI SQUARE = 17.50081 WITH 20 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIF LEVEL = 0.0139

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 145

TABLE 31. KNOWLEDGE OF CIVIC ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCIES BY AREA

AREA	CIVIC COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %	YES-ID 1.	YES-CAN'T ID 2.	NO 3.	NOT SURE 4.	NO RESPONSE 9.	ROW TOTAL
0.		44	29	59	7	1	140
		31.4	20.7	42.1	5.0	0.7	10.7
		10.5	7.6	15.2	6.2	8.3	
		3.3	2.2	4.5	0.5	0.1	
1. CENTER CITY		281	233	237	73	5	829
		33.9	28.1	28.6	8.8	0.6	63.1
		67.2	60.8	61.1	64.6	41.7	
		21.4	17.7	18.0	5.6	0.4	
3. SUBURBAN		30	43	24	14	0	111
		27.0	38.7	21.6	12.6	0.0	8.4
		7.2	11.2	6.2	12.4	0.0	
		2.3	3.3	1.8	1.1	0.0	
4. RURAL		63	78	68	19	6	234
		26.9	33.3	29.1	8.1	2.6	17.8
		15.1	20.4	17.5	16.8	50.0	
		4.8	5.9	5.2	1.4	0.5	
COLUMN TOTAL		418	383	388	113	12	1314
		31.8	29.1	29.5	8.6	0.9	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 35.71190 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0002

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 55

TABLE 32. MEMBERSHIP IN ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP BY AREA

AREA	MEMORG: COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %	YES 1.	NO 2.	NO RESPONSE 3.	9.	ROW TOTAL
	0.	15	125	0	0	140
		10.7	89.3	0.0	0.0	12.7
		11.5	10.7	0.0	0.0	
		1.1	9.5	0.0	0.0	
CENTER CITY	1.	82	736	3	7	828
		9.9	88.9	0.4	0.8	63.1
		63.1	62.8	100.0	87.5	
		6.2	56.1	0.2	0.5	
SUBURBAN	3.	15	96	0	0	111
		13.5	86.5	0.0	0.0	8.5
		11.5	8.2	0.0	0.0	
		1.1	7.3	0.0	0.0	
RURAL	4.	18	215	0	1	234
		7.7	91.9	0.0	0.4	17.8
		13.8	18.3	0.0	12.5	
		1.4	16.4	0.0	0.1	
COLUMN TOTAL		130	1172	3	8	1313
		9.9	89.3	0.2	0.6	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 7.16933 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.6195

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 56

TABLE 33. CONTACTS WITH PUBLIC OFFICIALS BY AREA

CONTOFF

AREA	COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %	1. YES-CALL OFF	2. YES-WROTE OFF	3. YES-VISIT OFF	4. YES -CALL NP	5. YES-WROTE NP	7. NO	8. NO RESPONSE	9.	ROW TOTAL
CENTER CITY	1.	81	48	17	5	6	660	2	11	830
		9.8	5.8	2.0	0.6	0.7	79.5	0.2	1.3	67.8
		71.7	64.9	77.3	83.3	60.0	67.0	100.0	84.6	
		6.6	3.9	1.4	0.4	0.5	53.9	0.2	0.9	
SUBURBAN	3.	12	8	0	0	2	89	0	0	111
		10.8	7.2	0.0	0.0	1.8	80.2	0.0	0.0	9.1
		10.6	10.8	0.0	0.0	20.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	
		1.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.2	7.3	0.0	0.0	
RURAL	4.	17	18	4	1	2	190	0	2	234
		7.3	7.7	1.7	0.4	0.9	81.2	0.0	0.9	19.1
		15.0	24.3	18.2	16.7	20.0	19.3	0.0	15.4	
		1.4	1.5	0.3	0.1	0.2	15.5	0.0	0.2	
	6.	3	0	1	0	0	44	0	0	48
		6.3	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	91.7	0.0	0.0	3.9
		2.7	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	
		0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	
	7.	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	
		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	
	COLUMN TOTAL	113	74	22	6	10	995	2	13	1225
		9.2	6.0	1.8	0.5	0.8	80.4	0.2	1.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 16.04867 WITH 28 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.9651

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 144

SECTION V

ETHNICITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Most existing knowledge concerning American attitudes toward the environment is based on surveys done of Anglo-Americans. One of the more interesting facets of our study was the bi-ethnic nature of the inquiry. We used both a Spanish and English survey instrument with approximately 18% of the sample interviews conducted in Spanish.

The section examines the responses to the survey stratified in terms of ethnicity.

When the respondents were asked to rank the public problems they considered most important, economic problems and crime/violence were ranked as the most important. Anglos identified the state of the economy as most important while Mexican-Americans rated crime and violence as most important (see Table 34). Concern for the environment and energy shortages were ranked low, seventh and fifth respectively for Anglos and Mexican-Americans. With the exception of the slight reversal at the top from the two ethnic samples, the rankings were very consistent as was the relative saliency of the issue areas. For example, the number one rated problem scale score for Anglos is approximately 42% of the total possible score, while the scale scores for the Mexican-American number one rated problem is approximately 44%. Here there is virtually no difference in environmental concerns between the Anglo and Mexican-American samples.

It is also important to know if different ethnic groups perceive the environment in different ways. We asked each respondent to tell us in their own words what the word "environment" meant. There was no significant ethnic difference in the way most respondents perceived the environment (see Table 35). Sixty-five and a half percent of the Anglos defined the environment in both physical and social terms while 63.3% of the Mexican-Americans did so. The only other significant bloc occured when almost one fourth of the Mexican-Americans had no definition (this conceiveably may have resulted from a language problem; there is not an exact Spanish translation for the term "environment").

We were interested also in the perception that the respondents had concerning the future of the environment. We asked our sample to rate the current conditions of the environment on an ascending scale of 1 to 9. Then we asked them to think about the environment five years from now and rate what they thought it would be on the same scale. One to three would be below average, four through six average, and seven through nine, above average.

Our data indicates a significant relationship between the perception

that respondents have of present and future environmental conditions and ethnicity. Table 36 shows that about twice as many Mexican-Americans as Anglos believe the present environment is in below average condition. At the other end of the scale, 57.7% of the Anglos believe environmental conditions are above average, while less than a third of the Mexican-Americans perceive the environment in such positive terms.

When we look at the perception respondents have of future environmental conditions, again there is a significant relationship based on ethnicity. The number of Mexican-Americans who see the future environment as below average have almost tripled as has the number of Anglos (see Table 37). Anglos continue to be more optimistic than Mexican-Americans (48.7% see future conditions as above average while 36.3% of the Mexican-American respondents agree), but the percentage has decreased from the perceptions of present environmental conditions.

Generally, then, Mexican-Americans perceive the environment to be in worse shape than Anglos, both now and five years hence.

Anglos and Mexican-Americans differed also when identifying the major contributors to the area's environmental problems. By far, the largest contributor singled out was the category for "individuals." Thirty-five point two percent of the Mexican-Americans and 34.4% of the Anglos identified individuals as the major source of environmental trouble (see Table 38). Government and industry were seen as the next worse offenders with 11.1% and 18.1% of the Anglo and Mexican-American respondents respectively identifying government and 12.9% and 8.7% identifying industry. Anglos also viewed traffic as a more serious contributor than Mexican-Americans.

One of the most important questions asked by the survey concerns the amount of money respondents are willing to spend on specific areas of environmental improvement. We gave each respondent a hypothetical $100 and asked how they would divide the money between five general environmental areas; auto exhaust pollution, water pollution, noise, waste disposal and recreational facilities. We placed respondent allocations into four categories: $0, $1-19, $20-49, and $50 plus.

Tables 39 through 43 include our findings in this area. We find no significant relationship between allocation of money and ethnicity in the problem areas of auto exhaust (39), noise (41), and trash (42). We do find a significant relationship when we look at water pollution (40) and development of recreational areas (43). Almost 20% of the Anglo respondents would be willing to allocate $50 or more to the problem of water pollution while 13.6% of the Mexican-Americans would do likewise. Over one-third of each group would spend nothing. Recreation appears to invite more participation than any other area. Only 23.2% of the Mexican-American respondents and 31.2% of the Anglo respondents (the lowest figures for any of the five problem areas) would contribute nothing to this issue. Mexican-American respondents are willing to allocate larger portions of their $100 than Anglos, but here, too, Anglos are willing to contribute more than to the other areas. Both groups seemed least concerned with the issue of noise.

We asked the respondents if they believed American's life style was contributing to our environmental problems. We found a significant, though slight, difference based on ethnicity. Table 44 shows that 69.6% of the

Anglo respondents said yes and 64.2% of the Mexican-American respondents said yes. This seems to support the data displayed in Table 38 (see above, p. 49) where individuals, rather than institutions, were singled out as contributing to much of our environmental difficulties.

In the general area of citizen knowledge and activism concerning the environment we again found significant relationships based on ethnicity. We tried first to ascertain the state of familiarity the respondents had with the various public and private organizations that address environmental concerns.

We asked if they knew of government organizations relating to the environment. Table 45 indicates that 39.2% of the Anglos responding did know of environment-oriented organizations as contrasted with 40% of the Mexican-American respondents. The number of respondents, however, who actually could identify the organizations was very low. Eighty-six Anglos identified the EPA while only four Mexican-Americans cited the agency. A local public service organization, COPS (Community Organized for Public Service, a group organized around Alinsky principles) had the widest recognition with 88 Anglos and 43 Mexican-Americans naming them.

When we asked about knowledge of local civic organizations with environmental concerns, the differences based on ethnicity were not as marked as with the knowledge of government organizations. Table 46 shows that 63.8% of the Anglo respondents and 54.7% of the Mexican American respondents were aware of such organizations. Again, the number of respondents who could identify specifically the organization was very small. Thirty-eight Anglos identified both COPS and the San Antonio Conservation Society; twenty-eight Mexican-Americans cited COPS.

We asked if respondents were members of these organizations. Only 11.7% of the Anglo respondents and 6.9% of the Mexican-American respondents held membership in an organization with environmental concerns (see Table 47). In other words about twice as many Anglos as Mexican-Americans belong to an organization which addresses environmental problems, but an overwhelming number of each group belongs to no such organization. Of these respondents who did belong to organizations, 14 Anglos were members of the SA Conservation Society and 10 Mexican-Americans were members of COPS.

Membership is, of course, only one measure of citizen activism. One of the most common ways people get involved in government is by contacting public officials or the media to offer viewpoints concerning public problems. Table 48 indicates that there is a significant relationship between ethnicity and respondents who contact public officials and the media. Eighty-five point seven percent of the Mexican-American respondents had made no such contact as contrasted with 77.6% of the Anglo respondents. Of those respondents that had made some contact, 9.8% of the Anglos and 7.7% of the Mexican-Americans did so by phoning a public official. Six point six percent of the Anglos had written public officials, but only 3.7% of the Mexican-Americans had done so.

Finally, we asked respondents if they had ever attended a meeting or rally which focused on environmental problems. There was no significant relationship between attendance and ethnicity. Eighty-seven point two percent of the Anglo respondents and 83.7% of the Mexican-American respondents had never attended any meeting with an environmental orientation.

TABLE 34. MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEMS BY ETHNIC GROUP

PROBLEM	ETHNIC GROUP (Rank) Anglo (N=548)	Mexican-American (N=385)
State of the Economy	1156 (1)	581 (3)
Crime and Violence	1088 (2)	864 (1)
Unemployment	734 (3)	696 (2)
Drug Abuses	502 (4)	481 (4)
Energy Shortages	500 (5)	372 (5)
Governmental Corruption	476 (6)	263 (6)
Environmental Problems	216 (7)	104 (7)
Racial Relations	148 (8)	75 (8)

Scale Scores were controlled on a 5-3-1 basis: 5 points for most important; 3, second most important; 1, third most important.

TABLE 35. DEFINITION OF ENVIRONMENT BY ETHNICITY

DEFINITION	ETHNICITY	
	Anglo	Mexican-American
Physical Characteristics	73 (16.6)	39 (7.9)
Neighborhood Characteristics	25 (5.7)	33 (6.7)
Social Characteristics	31 (7.1)	56 (11.4)
Physical & Social Characteristics	262 (59.7)	231 (47.0)
Times We Live In	9 (2.1)	6 (1.2)
No Idea	39 (8.9)	125 (25.5)
TOTAL	439	490

TABLE 36. PERCEPTION OF PRESENT ENVIRONMENT BY ETHNICITY

ETHNIC	COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %	ENVNOW POOR 1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	EXCELLENT 9.	ROW TOTAL
ANGLO	1.	8	2	42	60	140	112	142	164	84	754
		1.1	0.3	5.6	8.0	18.6	14.9	18.8	21.8	11.1	63.7
		21.1	20.0	67.7	66.7	54.5	64.7	67.9	71.9	72.4	
		0.7	0.2	3.6	5.1	11.8	9.5	12.0	13.9	7.1	
MEX-AMERICAN	2.	30	8	20	30	117	61	67	64	32	429
		7.0	1.9	4.7	7.0	27.3	14.2	15.6	14.9	7.5	36.3
		78.9	80.0	32.3	33.3	45.5	35.3	32.1	28.1	27.6	
		2.5	0.7	1.7	2.5	9.9	5.2	5.7	5.4	2.7	
COLUMN TOTAL		38	10	62	90	257	173	209	228	116	1183
		3.2	0.8	5.2	7.6	21.7	14.6	17.7	19.3	9.8	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 60.60889 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 186

TABLE 37. PERCEPTION OF FUTURE ENVIRONMENT BY ETHNICITY

ETHNIC	ENV5F	1. POOR	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9. EXCELLENT	ROW TOTAL
ANGLO	1. COUNT	38	39	62	56	82	74	94	146	90	678
	ROW %	5.6	5.8	9.1	8.3	11.8	10.9	13.9	21.5	13.3	65.1
	COL %	40.4	50.0	60.2	69.1	62.5	76.3	70.7	74.9	67.2	
	TOTAL %	3.7	3.7	6.0	5.4	7.7	7.1	9.0	14.0	8.6	
MEX-AMERICAN	2. COUNT	56	39	41	25	48	23	39	49	44	363
	ROW %	15.4	10.5	11.3	6.9	13.2	6.3	10.7	13.5	12.1	34.9
	COL %	59.6	50.0	39.8	30.9	37.5	23.7	29.3	25.1	32.8	
	TOTAL %	5.4	3.7	3.9	2.4	4.6	2.2	3.7	4.7	4.2	
COLUMN TOTAL		94	78	103	81	128	97	133	195	134	1041
		9.0	7.5	9.9	7.8	12.3	9.3	12.8	18.7	12.9	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 50.50067 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 328

TABLE 38. CONTRIBUTORS TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS BY ETHNICITY

M6TCONT

ETHNIC	COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %	1. INDUSTRY	2. INDIVIDUALS	3. GOVT	4. TRAFFIC	5. NONE	6. DRUGS	7. CORRUPTION	8. TOO MANY ANIMALS	9. NO RESPONSE	ROW TOTAL
1. ANGLO		184	278	90	92	34	18	8	6	178	804
		12.9	34.4	11.1	11.4	4.2	2.2	1.0	0.7	22.0	63.3
		71.7	62.8	51.4	83.6	75.6	52.9	53.3	75.0	58.9	
		8.1	21.8	7.0	7.2	2.7	1.4	0.6	0.5	13.9	
2. MEX-AMERICAN		41	165	85	18	11	16	7	2	124	469
		8.7	35.2	18.1	3.8	2.3	3.4	1.5	0.4	26.4	36.7
		28.3	37.2	48.6	16.4	24.4	47.1	46.7	25.0	41.1	
		3.2	12.9	6.7	1.4	0.9	1.3	0.5	0.2	9.7	
COLUMN TOTAL		145	443	175	110	45	34	15	8	302	1277
		11.4	34.7	13.7	8.6	3.5	2.7	1.2	0.6	23.6	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 42.73521 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 92

TABLE 39. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO AUTO EXHAUST BY ETHNICITY

ETHNIC		AUTOEX 0	1-19 1.	20-49 2.	50+ 3.	ROW TOTAL
ANGLO	1.	388	96	274	120	878
	ROW %	44.2	10.9	31.2	13.7	64.1
	COL %	64.5	58.9	63.3	70.2	
	TOTAL %	28.3	7.0	20.0	8.8	
MEX-AMERICAN	2.	214	67	159	51	491
	ROW %	43.6	13.6	32.4	10.4	35.9
	COL %	35.5	41.1	36.7	29.8	
	TOTAL %	15.6	4.9	11.6	3.7	
COLUMN TOTAL		602	163	433	171	1369
		44.0	11.9	31.6	12.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 4.82172 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1853

TABLE 40. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO WATER POLLUTION BY ETHNICITY

ETHNIC	CNTH2O	0.	1.	2.	3.	ROW TOTAL
ANGLO	1.	310	72	324	172	878
		35.3	8.2	36.9	19.6	64.1
		62.8	55.8	63.9	72.0	
		22.6	5.3	23.7	12.6	
MEX-AMERICAN	2.	184	57	183	67	491
		37.5	11.6	37.3	13.6	35.9
		37.2	44.2	36.1	28.0	
		13.4	4.2	13.4	4.9	
	COLUMN TOTAL	494	129	507	239	1369
		36.1	9.4	37.0	17.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 10.67754 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0136

TABLE 41. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO NOISE POLLUTION BY ETHNICITY

ETHNIC	RNOISE	0	1-19	20-49	50+	ROW TOTAL
	COUNT					
	ROW %					
	COL %					
	TOTAL %	0.	1.	2.	3.	
ANGLO	1.	540	168	144	26	878
		61.5	19.1	16.4	3.0	64.1
		66.9	61.8	58.1	61.9	
		39.4	12.3	10.5	1.9	
MEX-AMERICAN	2.	267	104	104	16	491
		54.4	21.2	21.2	3.3	35.9
		33.1	38.2	41.9	38.1	
		19.5	7.6	7.6	1.2	
	COLUMN TOTAL	807	273	248	42	1369
		58.9	19.9	18.1	3.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 7.43870 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0592

TABLE 42. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO TRASH POLLUTION BY ETHNICITY

ETHNIC	TSH	0.	1.	2.	3.	ROW TOTAL
	COUNT					
	ROW %	0	1-19	20-49	50+	
	COL %					
	TOTAL %					
1. ANGLO		350	106	302	120	878
		39.9	12.1	34.4	13.7	64.1
		68.1	60.6	62.4	61.2	
		25.6	7.7	22.1	8.8	
2. MEX-AMERICAN		164	69	182	76	491
		33.4	14.1	37.1	15.5	35.9
		31.9	39.4	37.6	38.8	
		12.0	5.0	13.3	5.6	
COLUMN TOTAL		514	175	484	196	1369
		37.5	12.8	35.4	14.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 5.82587 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.1204

TABLE 43. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO RECREATION BY ETHNICITY

ETHNIC	INEWREC 0	1-19	20-49	50+	ROW TOTAL
	COUNT				
	ROW %				
	COL %				
	TOTAL %	0.	1.	2.	3.	
1. ANGLO	274	98	286	220	878
	31.2	11.2	32.6	25.1	64.2
	70.6	64.5	61.8	60.1	
	20.0	7.2	20.9	16.1	
2. MEX-AMERICAN	114	54	177	146	491
	23.2	11.0	36.0	29.7	35.9
	29.4	35.5	38.2	39.9	
	8.3	3.9	12.9	10.7	
COLUMN TOTAL	388	152	463	366	1369
	28.3	11.1	33.8	26.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 10.80179 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0129

TABLE 44. LIFE STYLES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS BY ETHNICITY

ETHNIC	LIVECNT	1. YES	2. NO	3. BOTH	4.	5	9. NO RESPONSE	ROW TOTAL
1. ANGLO	COUNT	608	128	66	0	0	72	874
	ROW %	69.6	14.6	7.6	0.0	0.0	8.2	64.1
	COL %	65.9	57.1	75.9	0.0	0.0	56.7	
	TOTAL %	44.6	9.4	4.8	0.0	0.0	5.3	
2. MEX-AMERICAN	COUNT	314	96	21	2	1	55	489
	ROW %	64.2	19.6	4.3	0.4	0.2	11.2	35.9
	COL %	34.1	42.9	24.1	100.0	100.0	43.3	
	TOTAL %	23.0	7.8	1.5	0.1	0.1	4.0	
COLUMN TOTAL		922	224	87	2	1	127	1363
		67.6	16.4	6.4	0.1	0.1	9.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 19.69344 WITH 5 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0014

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

TABLE 45. KNOWLEDGE OF GOVERNMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCIES BY ETHNICITY

KNGAGN	COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %	ETHNIC: ANGLO 1.	MEXICAN-AMER 2.	ROW TOTAL
1. YES-IDENTIFY		258	79	337
		76.6	23.4	24.7
		29.5	16.1	
		18.9	5.8	
2. YES-CAN'T ID		260	127	387
		68.1	31.9	28.8
		29.7	24.9	
		19.0	8.9	
3. NO		282	236	518
		54.4	45.6	37.9
		32.2	48.2	
		20.6	17.3	
4. NOT SURE		70	43	113
		61.9	38.1	8.3
		8.0	8.8	
		5.1	3.1	
5.		2	0	2
		100.0	0.0	0.1
		0.2	0.0	
		0.1	0.0	
7.		0	1	1
		0.0	100.0	0.1
		0.0	0.2	
		0.0	0.1	
9. NO RESPONSE		4	9	13
		30.8	69.2	1.0
		0.5	1.8	
		0.3	0.7	
COLUMN TOTAL		876	490	1366
		64.1	35.9	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 55.76831 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3

TABLE 46. KNOWLEDGE OF CIVIC ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCIES BY ETHNICITY

ETHNIC	CIVIC COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %	1. YES-ID	2. YES-CAN'T ID	3. NO	4. NOT SURE	9. NO RESPONSE	ROW TOTAL
ANGLO	1.	312	246	240	72	4	874
		35.7	28.1	27.5	8.2	0.5	64.1
		72.4	62.3	58.4	63.2	30.8	
		22.9	18.0	17.6	5.3	0.3	
MEX-AMERICAN	2.	119	149	171	42	9	490
		24.3	30.4	34.9	8.6	1.8	35.9
		27.6	37.7	41.6	36.8	69.2	
		8.7	10.8	12.5	3.1	0.7	
COLUMN TOTAL		431	395	411	114	13	1364
		31.6	29.0	30.1	8.4	1.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 25.56741 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 5

TABLE 47. MEMBERSHIP IN ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP BY ETHNICITY

ETHNIC	MEMORG COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %	1. YES	2. NO	3. NO RESPONSE	9.	ROW TOTAL
1. ANGLO		102 11.7 75.0 7.5	764 87.6 62.8 56.1	3 0.0 0.0 0.2	6 0.7 75.0 0.4	872 64.0
2. MEX-AMERICAN		34 8.7 25.0 2.5	452 92.1 37.2 33.2	3 0.6 100.0 0.2	2 0.4 25.0 0.1	491 36.0
COLUMN TOTAL		136 10.0	1216 89.2	3 0.2	8 0.6	1363 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 13.61540 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0035

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

TABLE 48. CONTACTS WITH PUBLIC OFFICIALS BY ETHNICITY

CONTOFF

ETHNIC		1. YES-CALL OFF	2. YES-WROTE OFF	3. YES-VISIT OFF	4. YES-CALL NP	5. YES-WROTE NP	7. NO	8. NO RESPONSE	9.	ROW TOTAL
ANGLO	1.	86	58	22	2	14	1080	2	16	876
		9.8	6.6	2.5	0.2	1.1	77.6	0.2	1.8	64.1
		69.4	76.3	78.6	28.6	100.0	81.8	100.0	84.2	
		6.3	4.2	1.6	0.1	2.7	49.7	0.1	1.2	
MEX-AMERICAN	2.	38	18	6	5	0	421	0	3	491
		7.7	3.7	1.2	1.0	0.0	85.7	0.0	0.6	35.9
		30.6	23.7	21.4	71.4	0.0	38.2	0.0	15.8	
		2.8	1.3	0.4	0.4	0.0	30.8	0.0	0.2	
COLUMN TOTAL		124	76	28	7	14	1101	2	19	1367
		9.1	5.6	2.0	0.5	0.7	80.5	0.1	1.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 25.47363 WITH 7 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0006

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 2

SECTION 6

SES

We are interested in learning if a person's economic and educational status (SES) affects their perception of and responses to environmental problems. We might hypothesize, for example, that affluence and education will bear a direct relationship to one's ranking of environmental problems. That is, the higher one's income and more extensive one's education, the more likely one is to be aware of environmental problems. Or, one might suggest that individuals residing in deteriorating environments (i.e., low SES respondents) are more likely to be aware of environmental problems than those residing in a healthy environment. Note the potential conflict between these two assertions.

This section reports on the effect of SES on environmental attitudes. We have divided SES into three categories: low, medium, and high. Low SES represents an annual income of less than $5000 and less than high school educational level. Middle SES includes an income of $6000 through $15,000 and an educational level of high school. High SES stands for an income of above $15,000 and an educational level of college.

Do respondents at different SES levels differ in their perception of which public problems are most important? Table 49 indicates a relationship between SES and the ranking of public problems. Low SES respondents were concerned with economic issues (29.6%) and crime (17.5%). Middle SES respondents also focused on the economy (27.0%) and crime (17.3%). Upper SES respondents also cited the economy (29.8%), but were more concerned with "refuse" (11.1%) than with crime (10.6%). Upper SES respondents also saw government as an important problem (8.7%) while middle SES (4.1%) and lower SES (1.8%) respondents were less concerned.

The perception of the environment as our number one problem bore a direct relationship to SES. The higher the SES, the greater the concern with the environment. Two point seven percent of the lower SES respondents named the environment, as did 4.9% of the middle SES respondents and 6.6% of the upper SES respondents.

If we include "refuse" and "energy crisis" as environmental categories, there is a significant upswing in response. Seventeen point five percent of the low SES respondents, 22% of the middle SES respondents and 23.8% of the upper SES respondents then identify this general environmental category as our major problem.

When asked for a definition of "environment," we find that all three levels agreed to define "environment" in both physical and social terms (see Table 50). Sixty-nine point one percent of the middle level, 60.9% of the upper SES and 55.8% of the lower SES respondents defined "environment" this way. Over one-fourth (26.1%) of the higher SES respondents viewed the environment primarily in physical terms while almost a fifth (19.4%) of the lower SES respondents saw the environment in primarily social terms. There was a significant relationship between SES and response.

Does SES have an effect on the way respondents view today's environmental conditions and the way they anticipate conditions will be in the future? We did find a relationship between responses and SES. Table 51 displays data concerning present environmental conditions. Upper SES respondents believe today's environment is in better condition than respondents from either other SES level. Fifty-seven point one percent of the upper level respondents declared today's environment to be above average; 35.9% believed it was average and only 7% believed it below average. This is compared to 45.6%, 46%, and 8.4% for middle SES respondents and 36.3%, 50%, and 13.7% for lower SES respondents. In other words, the higher one's SES level the more positive one views the environmental conditions.

When we look five years into the future, the relationship between SES levels becomes less ordered (see Table 52). More upper SES respondents still view future conditions as average or above average than any other SES group, but now more middle SES respondents (48.3%) believe the future environment will be above average than do upper SES respondents (45.4%). Lower SES respondents are still the most pessimistic about environmental conditions with over one-third (34.3%) identifying future environmental conditions as below average. Note, however, that the percentage of upper and middle level respondents who believe that future environmental conditions will be below average have tripled.

We asked respondents to identify the major contributors to environmental problems; there was again a relationship between SES and responses. Table 53 indicates that 60% of the higher SES respondents, 42% of the lower SES respondents and 40.9% of the middle SES respondents believe that "individuals" contribute mostly to our environmental conditions. The only other category to receive consistant though minor support was "government" with 22.3%, 13.6%, and 13.3% of the lower, middle and upper class respondents respectively identifying it. Interestingly, industry, probably the most publicized polluter, was identified by no higher SES respondent.

The respondents also were influenced by SES when asked if Americans' life style contributes to our environmental problems. Eighty-one percent of the higher SES respondents, 78.1% of the middle SES respondents and 67.0% of the lower SES respondents said yes (see Table 54). This supports the data found in Table 53 in that individuals, rather than institutions are perceived to be the major contributors to environmental conditions.

Tables 55 through 59 identify the willingness of respondents to allocate a specified sum of money ($100) to help resolve various environmental problems. We divided responses into four categories: $0, $1-19, $20-49, and

$50 plus. We found a significant relationship between SES and the willingness to allocate money to the problem area of water pollution (see Table 56) and recreational areas (Table 59). There was no significant relationship between SES and the allocation of money to auto exhaust problems (Table 55), noise (Table 57), and trash and waste disposal (Table 58).

Upper SES respondents were more willing to allocate money to control water pollution than either of the other SES groups. Twenty point six percent of the higher SES would allocate $50 or more and 37% would appropriate between $20 and $49. The middle level SES respondents were almost as concerned with water problems. Nineteen percent would give $50 or more and 37.8%, $20-$49. Only 11.6% would give nothing (as contrasted with 34.9% and 33.7% of the middle and upper SES respondents respectively). Thus, the higher one's SES level, the more willing one was to allocate money to water problems.

Middle SES respondents were more concerned than the other two levels with recreational areas. Thirty-one point seven percent would allocate $50 or more and 75% would allocate at least $50 and 71%, at least $10. The upper SES respondents, perhaps because they had access to alternative recreational outlets, were less willing to contribute money to this area with about a third (32.4%) refusing to allocate any money at all.

Public action on the environment may be directly related to the public's knowledge of andparticipation in the various civic and governmental groups concerned with the environment. We examined the affect of SES on citizen knowledge and action.

When questioned about their awareness of government agencies or organizations in the San Antonio area concerned with the environment, respondents were influenced by SES. Table 60 indicates that over half of the lower SES respondents (52.2%) know of no agency so involved while 61% of the middle level respondents and 54.1% of the upper level respondents were able to identify some organizations. In the latter two responses almost one-third of the respondents were able to identify specifically which agency or organization they knew. There was, however, no overall consensus relating to which agencies or organizations could be identified. Only 9.8% of the middle level respondents cited the EPA as an organization focusing on the environment while 1.7% of the lower level and an astonishingly 0% of the upper level respondents did so. Only one organization, COPS (a local organization which has generated considerable publicity in San Antonio for its activities in public affairs) was identified by more than 10% of the respondents at any level (11.2% of the middle level respondents cited COPS).

The respondents knowledge of local citizen or civic groups was much broader than their knowledge of government organizations. Forty-nine point nine percent of the lower SES respondents, 67.2% of the middle level respondents and 63.8% of the upper level respondents did have some knowledge of such groups (see Table 61). There is a relationship here between SES and the responses.

As with government organizations, the knowledge of such groups was quite general with few respondents actually able to name a specific group. Nine

point one percent of the upper level respondents were able to identify the San Antonio Conservation Society, but no other group was identified by more than 6% of any SES level of respondents.

No SES level contained a significant number of respondents who admitted to holding membership in a group oriented toward environmental concerns. Table 62 shows that 11.9% of the middle level respondents and 7.4% of the lower level respondents said they were members of some organization concerned with the environment. No upper level respondents held memberships. There was no significant relationship based on SES.

When questioned about personal involvement in public issues relating to the environment, respondents were affected by SES (see Table 63). Eighty-seven point four percent of the lower SES respondents, 78.5% of the middle SES respondents and 66.7% of the upper SES respondents had never contacted any public official concerning environmental problems, but no other method of contact was utilized frequently by any SES level.

Table 64 contains the general patterns of public apathy by indicating that very few respondents at any SES level had attended any meeting concerning the environment. The middle and lower SES respondents were almost identical in their responses with 13.5% and 13.4% respectively having attended some meetings. No upper SES respondent had attended such a meeting. There was no significant relationship based on SES.

These latter tables describe an overwhelmingly apathetic reaction to environmental problems.

TABLE 49. MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEMS BY SES

IMPTPBS1

SES	COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOT %	1. CRIME	2. ECONOMY	3. ENERGY CRISIS	4. ENV PROB	5. GOVT	6. CORRUPTION	7. REFUSE	8. NOT SURE	9. NO RESPONSE	ROW TOTAL
1. LOW		58	98	15	9	6	5	34	71	35	331
		17.5	29.6	4.5	2.7	1.8	1.5	10.3	21.5	10.6	27.0
		31.0	28.0	20.0	15.3	10.2	18.5	26.8	35.5	25.0	
		4.7	8.0	1.2	0.7	0.5	0.4	2.8	5.8	2.9	
2. MIDDLE		89	139	37	25	21	20	91	79	94	515
		17.3	27.0	7.2	4.9	4.1	3.9	9.9	15.3	18.5	42.0
		47.6	39.7	49.3	42.4	35.0	74.1	48.2	39.5	38.6	
		7.3	11.3	3.0	2.0	1.7	1.6	4.2	6.4	4.4	
3. HIGH		40	113	23	25	33	2	42	50	51	379
		10.6	29.8	6.1	6.6	8.7	0.5	11.1	13.2	13.5	30.9
		21.4	32.3	30.7	42.4	55.0	7.4	33.1	25.0	36.4	
		3.3	9.2	1.9	2.0	2.7	0.2	3.4	4.1	4.2	
COLUMN TOTAL		187	350	75	59	60	27	127	200	140	1225
		15.3	28.6	6.1	4.8	4.9	2.2	10.4	16.3	11.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 57.29786 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 144

TABLE 50. DEFINITION OF ENVIRONMENT BY SES

SES	COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %	ENVPROB 1. PHYSICAL CHAR	2. INC NB CHAR	3. PRIMARILY SOCIAL	4. PHYSICAL AND	5. TIMES WE LIVE IN	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	30	31	55	128	4	248
		12.1	12.5	22.2	51.6	1.6	21.3
		16.2	37.3	46.6	17.0	16.7	
		2.6	2.7	4.7	11.0	0.3	
MIDDLE	2.	94	29	40	359	10	532
		17.7	5.5	7.5	67.5	1.9	45.7
		50.8	34.9	33.9	47.5	41.7	
		8.1	2.5	3.4	30.8	0.9	
HIGH	3.	61	23	23	268	10	385
		15.8	6.0	6.0	69.6	2.6	33.0
		33.0	27.7	19.5	35.5	41.7	
		5.2	2.0	2.0	23.0	0.9	
	COLUMN TOTAL	185	83	118	755	24	1165
		15.9	7.1	10.1	64.8	2.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 71.34039 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 284

TABLE 51. PERCEPTION OF PRESENT ENVIRONMENT BY SES

SES	COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %	ENVNOW POOR 1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	EXCELLEN T 9.	ROW TOTAL
1. LOW		19	2	28	16	84	58	93	37	19	356
		6.3	2.7	6.7	5.3	28.0	16.7	17.7	12.3	6.3	25.4
		50.0	20.0	32.3	17.8	32.7	20.9	25.4	16.2	16.4	
		1.6	0.2	1.7	1.4	7.1	4.2	4.5	3.1	1.6	
2. MIDDLE		12	6	26	42	136	89	97	91	51	524
		2.3	1.1	5.0	8.0	26.0	13.2	18.5	17.4	9.7	44.3
		31.6	60.0	41.9	46.7	52.6	30.9	46.4	39.9	44.0	
		1.0	0.5	2.2	3.6	11.9	5.0	8.2	7.7	4.3	
3. HIGH		7	2	16	32	43	54	59	100	46	359
		1.9	0.6	4.5	8.9	12.0	15.0	16.4	27.9	12.8	30.3
		18.4	20.0	25.8	35.6	16.7	31.2	28.2	43.6	39.7	
		0.6	0.2	1.4	2.7	3.6	4.6	5.0	8.5	3.9	
COLUMN TOTAL		38	10	62	90	257	173	209	228	116	1183
		3.2	0.8	5.2	7.6	21.7	14.6	17.7	19.3	9.8	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 72.72937 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 186

TABLE 52. PERCEPTION OF FUTURE ENVIRONMENT BY SES

SES	COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %	ENVSF POOR 1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	EXCELLENT 9.	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	42	19	27	18	33	25	29	33	31	257
		16.3	7.4	10.5	7.0	12.8	9.7	11.3	12.8	12.1	24.7
		44.7	25.0	26.2	22.2	25.8	25.8	21.8	16.7	23.1	
		4.0	1.8	2.6	1.7	3.2	2.4	2.8	3.2	3.0	
MIDDLE	2.	26	32	46	37	54	35	81	98	61	456
		5.7	8.3	10.1	8.1	11.8	7.7	17.8	21.5	13.4	43.8
		27.7	50.8	44.7	45.7	42.2	36.1	45.9	50.3	45.5	
		2.5	3.7	4.4	3.6	5.2	3.4	5.9	9.4	5.9	
HIGH	3.	26	19	30	26	41	37	43	64	42	328
		7.9	5.8	9.1	7.9	12.5	11.3	13.1	19.5	12.8	31.5
		27.7	25.0	29.1	32.1	32.0	38.1	32.3	32.8	31.3	
		2.5	1.8	2.9	2.5	3.9	3.6	4.1	6.1	4.0	
	COLUMN TOTAL	94	75	103	81	128	97	133	195	134	1041
		9.0	7.3	9.9	7.8	12.3	9.3	12.8	18.7	12.9	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 33.94043 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0059

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 328

TABLE 53. CONTRIBUTORS TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS BY SES

SES	MSTCONT	INDUSTRY	INDIVIDUALS	GOVT	TRAFFIC	NONE	DRUGS	CORRUPTION	TOO MANY ANIMALS	NO RESPONSE	ROW TOTAL
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	
LOW	1. COUNT	21	102	59	19	14	11	8	4	122	360
	ROW %	5.8	28.3	16.4	5.3	3.9	3.1	2.2	1.1	33.9	28.2
	COL %	14.5	23.0	33.7	17.3	31.1	32.4	53.3	50.0	40.4	
	TOTAL %	1.6	8.0	4.6	1.5	1.1	0.9	0.6	0.3	9.6	
MIDDLE	2. COUNT	69	216	74	42	21	13	5	2	97	539
	ROW %	12.8	40.1	13.7	7.8	3.9	2.4	0.9	0.4	18.0	42.2
	COL %	47.6	48.8	42.3	38.2	46.7	38.2	33.3	25.0	32.1	
	TOTAL %	5.4	16.9	5.8	3.3	1.6	1.0	0.4	0.2	7.6	
HIGH	3. COUNT	55	125	42	49	10	10	2	2	83	378
	ROW %	14.6	33.1	11.1	13.0	2.6	2.6	0.5	0.5	22.0	29.6
	COL %	37.9	28.2	24.0	44.5	22.2	29.4	13.3	25.0	27.5	
	TOTAL %	4.3	9.8	3.3	3.8	0.8	0.8	0.2	0.2	6.5	
COLUMN TOTAL		145	443	175	110	45	34	15	8	302	1277
		11.4	34.7	13.7	8.6	3.5	2.7	1.2	0.6	23.6	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 72.33075 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = -0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 92

TABLE 54. LIFE STYLES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS BY SES

SES	LIVECNT	1. YES	2. NO	3. BOTH	4.	5.	9. NO RESPONSE	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	209	92	19	0	0	52	372
	ROW %	56.2	24.7	5.1	0.0	0.0	14.0	27.3
	COL %	22.7	41.1	21.8	0.0	0.0	40.9	
	TOTAL %	15.3	6.7	1.4	0.0	0.0	3.8	
MIDDLE	2.	420	89	32	2	1	38	582
	ROW %	72.2	15.3	5.5	0.3	0.2	6.5	42.7
	COL %	45.6	39.7	36.8	100.0	100.0	29.9	
	TOTAL %	30.8	6.5	2.3	0.1	0.1	2.8	
HIGH	3.	293	43	36	0	0	37	409
	ROW %	71.6	10.5	8.8	0.0	0.0	9.0	30.0
	COL %	31.8	19.2	41.4	0.0	0.0	29.1	
	TOTAL %	21.5	3.2	2.6	0.0	0.0	2.7	
COLUMN TOTAL		922	224	87	2	1	127	1363
		67.6	16.4	6.4	0.1	0.1	9.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 57.71412 WITH 10 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

TABLE 55. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO AUTO EXHAUS BY SES

SES	AUTOEX	0	1-19	20-49	50+	ROW TOTAL
	COUNT					
	ROW %					
	COL %					
	TOTAL %	0.	1.	2.	3.	
	1.	161	48	126	37	372
LOW		43.3	12.9	33.9	9.9	27.2
		26.7	29.4	29.1	21.6	
		11.8	3.5	9.2	2.7	
	2.	266	68	178	72	584
MIDDLE		45.5	11.6	30.5	12.3	42.7
		44.2	41.7	41.1	42.1	
		19.4	5.0	13.0	5.3	
	3.	175	47	129	62	413
HIGH		42.4	11.4	31.2	15.0	30.2
		29.1	28.8	29.8	36.3	
		12.8	3.4	9.4	4.5	
	COLUMN TOTAL	602	163	433	171	1369
		44.0	11.9	31.6	12.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 5.94883 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.4289

TABLE 56. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO WATER POLLUTION BY SES

SES	CNTH20	0	1-19	20-49	50+	ROW TOTAL
		0.	1.	2.	3.	
LOW	1.	151	45	133	43	372
	ROW %	40.6	12.1	35.8	11.6	27.2
	COL %	30.6	34.9	26.2	18.0	
	TOTAL %	11.0	3.3	9.7	3.1	
MIDDLE	2.	204	48	221	111	584
	ROW %	34.9	8.2	37.8	19.0	42.7
	COL %	41.3	37.2	43.6	46.4	
	TOTAL %	14.9	3.5	16.1	8.1	
HIGH	3.	139	36	153	85	413
	ROW %	33.7	8.7	37.0	20.6	30.2
	COL %	28.1	27.9	30.2	35.6	
	TOTAL %	10.2	2.6	11.2	6.2	
	COLUMN TOTAL	494	129	507	239	1369
		36.1	9.4	37.0	17.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 17.71563 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0070

TABLE 57. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO NOISE POLLUTION BY SES

SES	RNOISE	0	1-19	20-49	50+	ROW TOTAL
	COUNT					
	ROW %	0.	1.	2.	3.	
	COL %					
	TOTAL %					
LOW	1.	198	77	86	11	372
		53.2	20.7	23.1	3.0	27.2
		24.5	28.3	34.7	26.2	
		14.5	5.6	6.3	0.8	
MIDDLE	2.	361	108	98	17	584
		61.8	18.5	16.8	2.9	42.7
		44.7	39.7	39.5	40.5	
		26.4	7.9	7.2	1.2	
HIGH	3.	248	87	64	14	413
		60.0	21.1	15.5	3.4	30.2
		30.7	32.0	25.8	33.3	
		18.1	6.4	4.7	1.0	
	COLUMN TOTAL	807	272	248	42	1369
		58.9	19.9	18.1	3.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 11.42739 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0760

TABLE 58. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO TRASH POLLUTION BY SES

SES	TSH COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %	0 (0.)	1-19 (1.)	20-49 (2.)	50+ (3.)	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	137	53	120	62	372
		36.8	14.2	32.3	16.7	27.2
		26.7	30.3	24.8	31.6	
		10.0	3.9	8.8	4.5	
MIDDLE	2.	224	60	211	89	584
		38.4	10.3	36.1	15.2	42.7
		43.6	34.3	43.6	45.4	
		16.4	4.4	15.4	6.5	
HIGH	3.	153	62	153	45	413
		37.0	15.0	37.0	10.9	30.2
		29.8	35.4	31.6	23.0	
		11.2	4.5	11.2	3.3	
	COLUMN TOTAL	514	175	484	196	1369
		37.5	12.8	35.4	14.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 11.88655 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0645

TABLE 59. ALLOCATION OF MONEY TO RECREATION BY SES

SES	INEWREC	0	1-19	20-49	50+	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	108	38	138	88	372
		29.0	10.2	37.1	23.7	27.2
		27.8	25.0	29.8	24.0	
		7.9	2.8	10.1	6.4	
MIDDLE	2.	146	53	200	185	584
		25.0	9.1	34.2	31.7	42.7
		37.6	34.9	43.2	50.5	
		10.7	3.9	14.6	13.5	
HIGH	3.	134	61	125	93	413
		32.4	14.8	30.3	22.5	30.2
		34.5	40.1	27.0	25.4	
		9.8	4.5	9.1	6.8	
	COLUMN TOTAL	388	152	463	366	1369
		28.3	11.1	33.8	26.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 24.43435 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0004

TABLE 60. KNOWLEDGE OF GOVERNMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCIES BY SES

SES	KNGAGN	1. YES-IDENTIFY	2. YES-CAN'T ID	3. NO	4. NOT SURE	5.	7.	9. NO RESPONSE	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1. COUNT	50	83	198	31	0	0	8	370
	ROW %	13.5	22.4	53.5	8.4	0.0	0.0	2.2	27.1
	COL %	14.8	21.7	38.2	27.4	0.0	0.0	61.5	
	TOTAL %	3.7	6.1	14.5	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.6	
MIDDLE	2. COUNT	148	162	219	49	0	0	5	583
	ROW %	25.4	27.8	37.6	8.4	0.0	0.0	0.9	42.7
	COL %	43.9	42.4	42.3	43.4	0.0	0.0	38.5	
	TOTAL %	10.8	11.9	16.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.4	
HIGH	3. COUNT	139	137	101	33	2	1	0	413
	ROW %	33.7	33.2	24.5	8.0	0.5	0.2	0.0	30.2
	COL %	41.2	35.9	19.5	29.2	100.0	100.0	0.0	
	TOTAL %	10.2	10.0	7.4	2.4	0.1	0.1	0.0	
COLUMN TOTAL		337	382	518	113	2	1	13	1366
		24.7	28.0	37.9	8.3	0.1	0.1	1.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 100.51826 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3

TABLE 61. KNOWLEDGE OF CIVIC ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCIES BY SES

SES	CIVIC COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %	YES-ID 1.	YES-CAN'T ID 2.	NO 3.	NOT SURE 4.	NO RESPONSE 9.	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	73	101	152	41	3	370
		19.7	27.3	41.1	11.1	0.8	27.1
		16.9	25.6	37.0	36.0	23.1	
		5.4	7.4	11.1	3.0	0.2	
MIDDLE	2.	202	157	169	48	7	583
		34.6	26.9	29.0	8.2	1.2	42.7
		46.9	39.7	41.1	42.1	53.8	
		14.8	11.5	12.4	3.5	0.5	
HIGH	3.	156	137	90	25	3	411
		38.0	33.3	21.9	6.1	0.7	30.1
		36.2	34.7	21.9	21.9	23.1	
		11.4	10.0	6.6	1.8	0.2	
	COLUMN TOTAL	431	395	411	114	13	1364
		31.6	29.0	30.1	8.4	1.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 58.29601 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 5

TABLE 62. MEMBERSHIP IN ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP BY SES

SES	MEMORG	YES 1.	NO 2.	NO RESPONSE 3.	9.	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	23	347	0	0	370
		6.2	93.8	0.0	0.0	27.1
		16.9	28.5	0.0	0.0	
		1.7	25.5	0.0	0.0	
MIDDLE	2.	63	512	2	7	584
		10.8	87.7	0.3	1.2	42.8
		46.3	42.1	66.7	87.5	
		4.6	37.6	0.1	0.5	
HIGH	3.	50	357	1	1	409
		12.2	87.3	0.2	0.2	30.0
		36.8	29.4	33.3	12.5	
		3.7	26.2	0.1	0.1	
COLUMN TOTAL		136	1216	3	8	1363
		10.0	89.2	0.2	0.6	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 16.82733 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0099

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

TABLE 62. MEMBERSHIP IN ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP BY SES

SES	COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %	MEMORG 1. YES	2. NO	3. NO RESPONSE	9.	ROW TOTAL
1. LOW		23	347	0	0	370
		6.2	93.8	0.0	0.0	27.1
		16.9	28.5	0.0	0.0	
		1.7	25.5	0.0	0.0	
2. MIDDLE		63	512	2	7	584
		10.8	87.7	0.3	1.2	42.8
		46.3	42.1	66.7	87.5	
		4.6	37.6	0.1	0.5	
3. HIGH		50	357	1	1	409
		12.2	87.3	0.2	0.2	30.0
		36.8	29.4	33.3	12.5	
		3.7	26.2	0.1	0.1	
COLUMN TOTAL		136	1216	3	8	1363
		10.0	89.2	0.2	0.6	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 16.82733 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0099

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

TABLE 63. CONTACTS WITH PUBLIC OFFICIALS BY SES

CONTOFF

SES	COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %	YES-CALL OFF 1.	YES-WROTE OFF 2.	YES-VISIT OFF 3.	YES-CALL NP 4.	YES-WROTE NP 5.	NO 7.	NO RESPONSE 8.	NO RESPONSE 9.	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	35	2	4	1	0	325	2	1	370
		9.5	0.5	1.1	0.3	0.0	87.8	0.5	0.3	27.1
		28.2	2.6	14.3	14.3	0.0	29.5	100.0	5.3	
		2.6	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.0	23.8	0.1	0.1	
MIDDLE	2.	45	44	11	6	4	467	0	7	584
		7.7	7.5	1.9	1.0	0.7	80.0	0.0	1.2	42.7
		36.3	57.9	39.3	85.7	40.0	42.4	0.0	36.8	
		3.3	3.2	0.8	0.4	0.3	34.2	0.0	0.5	
HIGH	3.	44	30	13	0	6	309	0	11	413
		10.7	7.3	3.1	0.0	1.5	74.8	0.0	2.7	30.2
		35.5	39.5	46.4	0.0	60.0	28.1	0.0	57.9	
		3.2	2.2	1.0	0.0	0.4	22.6	0.0	0.8	
	COLUMN TOTAL	124	76	28	7	10	1101	2	19	1367
		9.1	5.6	2.0	0.5	0.7	80.5	0.1	1.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 58.70102 WITH 14 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 2

TABLE 64. ATTENDANCE AT ENVIRONMENTAL MEETINGS BY SES

SES	COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %	ATTMEET 1. YES	2. NO	4.	9. NO RESPONSE	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	46	324	0	2	372
		12.4	87.1	0.0	0.5	27.2
		25.6	27.6	0.0	18.2	
		3.4	23.7	0.0	0.1	
MIDDLE	2.	84	492	1	6	583
		14.4	84.4	0.2	1.0	42.7
		46.7	41.9	100.0	54.5	
		6.1	36.0	0.1	0.4	
HIGH	3.	50	358	0	3	411
		12.2	87.1	0.0	0.7	30.1
		27.8	30.5	0.0	27.3	
		3.7	26.2	0.0	0.2	
	COLUMN TOTAL	180	1174	1	11	1366
		13.2	85.9	0.1	0.8	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 3.52736 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.7404

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3

SECTION 7

MEDIA INFLUENCE

The people's perception of any public problem will be directly affected by the sources from which information about the problems are derived. We wanted to know which media sources respondents relied on and what amount of trust they placed in the media. During the period in which the survey was conducted, we monitored the San Antonio area media to identify any major coverage of environmental conditions. No environmental issue emerged which could be considered a story of major importance to the media. The media did cover related stories (e.g., traffic problems, general energy issues, etc.), and we attempted to ascertain if respondents were aware of this coverage.

This section addresses the influence of the media on respondents' environmental attitudes.

We asked the respondents to identify the media sources from which they derived information concerning national, state and local events. As noted in Section 3 (see above, p. 7), television was the primary source for information at all three levels with newspapers the most frequently cited secondary source.

Tables 65, 66, and 67 show that area does not affect television's dominance as the primary media source. Over half of the respondents living in the center city, suburbs and rural areas gleaned most of their information re national events from TV. Center city residents relied on TV the most; of those 69.7% citing TV, most resided in the center city. This pattern remained essentially the same when we looked at state and local problems.

When we control for ethnicity, we find that more Anglos than Mexican-Americans rely on TV for information at the national and state levels, while Mexican-Americans rely more on TV for information concerning local problems (see Tables 68, 69, 70). At all three levels, the differences, though significant by Chi Square, are slight. We find also that Mexican-Americans are more likely than Anglos to utilize the radio as an informational source at all three levels.

The single exception to television's number one position as a news source is found when we control for SES. Focusing on national and state problems, all three SES groups identify TV as their major news source (see Tables 71, 72, 73). However, upper SES respondents said they used newspapers more than television to garner news concerning local problems. We found also that lower SES respondents utilize the radio much more than their counterparts

at the other levels.

We asked the respondents to identify which source of information they believed was most likely to give an unbiased and accurate report of news events. Overall, 42.5% of the respondents believed TV to be the most accurate while 20.3% cited newspapers (and 14.5% said "none") (see above, Section 3, p. 8).

This trust in the probity of television existed regardless of where the respondent lived. Table 74 shows that 45.1% of the rural respondents, 43.1% of the inner city respondents and 36.9% of the suburban respondents found TV to be the most reliable source. These figures reflect, however, a large amount of distrust in that no news source is believed by at least half of the respondents to be accurate. Over one-fifth of the suburban respondents found no news source reliable. Note, however, that ChiSquare indicates no significance when we control for area.

We do find significance where we control for ethnicity. Table 75 shows that of those identifying television as the most trustworthy, 60.9% are Anglos and 39.2, Mexican-Americans (although Mexican-Americans trust TV reporting more than any other source). Anglos also are more suspicious of all forms of reporting with 85.4% of those answering "none" while only 14.6% of the Mexican-American respondents believed that no media source was accurate.

When we look at SES, again we find significant differences. Lower and middle SES respondents identified TV as the most accurate news source, but over one-third of the upper SES respondents said no news source was accurate and another third identified newspapers as the most accurate source (see Table 76). Only 12.5% of the upper respondents believed TV to be reliable (this was less than 1% of all respondents who identified TV).

Did the respondents recall reading or seeing or hearing stories concerning the environment? We found that 48.2% of the respondents recalled reading an environmental story in a newspaper and 45.5% had recently seen an environmental story on television (see above Section 3, p. 7).

Table 77 shows that of those that had recently read something concerning the environment in the newspaper, most resided in the center city. At the same time over half of the suburban residents recalled reading such a story (as contrasted with 38.5% of those in the center city and 30% of those living in rural areas). Note that 79.4% of the center city respondents, 93.6% of the suburban residents and 69% of the rural residents take newspapers.

Suburban residents also recalled seeing more environmental reports on TV than the other two areas (see Table 78). Over half of the rural residents and half (49.2%) of the center city did not recall seeing any story on television relating to the environment.

Controlling for ethnicity, we find that 87.7% of the Anglos take a newspaper as contrasted with 68.9% of the Mexican-Americans (see Table 79). Fifty-five point one percent of the Anglos had recently read newspaper stories concerning the environment while 36% of the Mexican-Americans had seen en-

vironmental stories.

Almost half of each ethnic group recalled seeing television stories that related to environmental conditions (see Table 80). Forty-six point seven percent of the Anglo respondents and 43.6% of the Mexican-American respondents had viewed some television comment concerning the environment.

We controlled for SES and again found significant relationships. Ninety-five point eight percent of the upper level SES respondents took newspapers, 89.3% of the middle SES respondents did likewise, while only 66.4% of the lower SES level respondents took a newspaper (see Table 81). We find significant differences between the SES level among those respondents who recalled reading a newspaper story on the environment. Only 33.9% of the lower SES had read such stories, contrasted with 58.3% and 56.6% of the upper and middle level respondents respectively.

As might be expected, the awareness of television shows was distributed somewhat more evenly (see Table 82). Here 39.9% of the lower SES respondents recalled seeing an environmental story while 50% of the upper and middle level respondents had such recollection.

TABLE 65. NATIONAL MEDIA USE BY AREA

AREA	NTLMEDIA	1. NEWSPAPERS	2. MAGAZINES	3. RADIO	4. TELEVISION	5. FRIENDS	6. OTHER	7. RADIO AND TV	8. NEWSPAPER & TV	9. NO RESPONSE	ROW TOTAL
CENTER CITY	1. COUNT	161	37	50	451	8	9	13	58	12	792
	ROW %	20.3	3.8	6.3	56.9	1.0	1.1	1.6	7.3	1.5	67.3
	COL %	63.9	58.8	55.6	69.7	72.7	90.0	72.2	78.4	52.2	
	TOTAL %	13.7	2.6	4.3	38.4	0.7	0.8	1.1	4.9	1.0	
SUBURBAN	3. COUNT	27	11	2	61	0	0	2	2	6	111
	ROW %	24.3	9.9	1.8	55.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	1.8	5.4	9.4
	COL %	10.7	21.6	2.2	9.4	0.0	0.0	11.1	2.7	26.1	
	TOTAL %	2.3	0.9	0.2	5.2	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.5	
RURAL	4. COUNT	50	6	34	115	3	1	3	10	5	227
	ROW %	22.0	2.6	15.0	50.7	1.3	0.4	1.3	4.4	2.2	19.3
	COL %	19.8	11.8	37.8	17.8	27.3	10.0	16.7	13.5	21.7	
	TOTAL %	4.3	0.5	2.9	9.8	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.9	0.4	
	6. COUNT	14	4	4	20	0	0	0	2	0	44
	ROW %	31.8	9.1	9.1	45.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	3.7
	COL %	5.6	7.8	4.4	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.0	
	TOTAL %	1.2	0.3	0.3	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	
	7. COUNT	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
	ROW %	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.2
	COL %	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.0	
	TOTAL %	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	
	COLUMN TOTAL	252	51	90	647	11	10	18	74	23	1176
		21.4	4.3	7.7	55.0	0.9	0.9	1.5	6.3	2.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 90.22754 WITH 32 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 193

TABLE 66. STATE MEDIA USE BY AREA

AREA	SMEDIA	NEWSPAPERS (1.)	MAGAZINES (2.)	RADIO (3.)	TELEVISION (4.)	FRIENDS (5.)	OTHER (6.)	RADIO AND TV (7.)	NEWSPAPER & TV (8.)	NO RESPONSE (9.)	ROW TOTAL
0,	COUNT	51	3	11	51	2	1	5	15	3	142
	ROW %	35.9	2.1	7.7	35.9	1.4	0.7	3.5	10.6	2.1	11.1
	COL %	13.4	15.0	9.5	8.5	13.3	8.3	20.0	17.6	10.0	
	TOTAL %	4.0	0.2	0.9	4.0	0.2	0.1	0.4	1.2	0.2	
1, CENTER CITY	COUNT	229	11	67	390	11	8	15	57	16	804
	ROW %	28.5	1.4	8.3	48.5	1.4	1.0	1.9	7.1	2.0	62.6
	COL %	60.3	55.0	57.8	64.9	73.3	66.7	60.0	67.1	53.3	
	TOTAL %	17.8	0.9	5.2	30.4	0.9	0.6	1.2	4.4	1.2	
3, SUBURBAN	COUNT	42	2	2	51	0	2	2	4	6	111
	ROW %	37.8	1.8	1.8	45.9	0.0	1.8	1.8	3.6	5.4	8.6
	COL %	11.1	10.0	1.7	8.5	0.0	16.7	8.0	4.7	20.0	
	TOTAL %	3.3	0.2	0.2	4.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.5	
4, RURAL	COUNT	58	4	36	109	2	1	3	9	5	227
	ROW %	25.6	1.8	15.9	48.0	0.9	0.4	1.3	4.0	2.2	17.7
	COL %	15.3	20.0	31.0	18.1	13.3	8.3	12.0	10.6	16.7	
	TOTAL %	4.5	0.3	2.8	8.5	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.7	0.4	
COLUMN TOTAL		380	20	116	601	15	12	25	85	30	1284
		29.6	1.6	9.0	46.8	1.2	0.9	1.9	6.6	2.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 47.82241 WITH 24 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0027

TABLE 67. LOCAL MEDIA USE BY AREA

LMEDIA

AREA	COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %	1. NEWSPAPERS	2. MAGAZINES	3. RADIO	4. TELEVISION	5. FRIENDS	6. OTHER	7. RADIO AND TV	8. NEWSPAPER & TV	9. NO RESPONSE	ROW TOTAL
	0.	38	2	15	57	5	1	5	12	3	1
		27.5	1.4	10.9	41.3	3.6	0.7	3.6	8.7	2.2	10
		10.0	25.0	10.3	10.1	13.2	10.0	21.7	13.5	12.0	
		3.0	0.2	1.2	4.4	0.4	0.1	0.4	0.9	0.2	
CENTER CITY	1.	235	6	84	364	26	6	13	66	12	8
		29.2	0.7	10.4	45.2	2.5	0.7	1.6	8.2	1.5	62
		61.8	75.0	57.5	64.7	52.6	60.0	56.5	74.2	48.0	
		18.3	0.5	6.6	28.4	1.6	0.5	1.0	5.1	0.9	
SUBURBAN	3.	44	0	6	49	4	2	2	2	6	1
		39.6	0.0	5.4	44.1	3.6	1.8	1.8	1.8	5.4	8
		11.6	0.0	4.1	8.7	10.5	20.0	8.7	2.2	24.0	
		3.4	0.0	0.5	3.8	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.5	
RURAL	4.	63	0	41	93	13	1	3	9	4	2
		27.8	0.0	18.1	41.0	5.7	0.4	1.3	4.0	1.8	17
		16.6	0.0	28.1	16.5	34.2	10.0	13.0	10.1	16.0	
		4.9	0.0	3.2	7.3	1.0	0.1	0.2	0.7	0.3	
	COLUMN TOTAL	380	8	146	563	38	10	23	89	25	12
		29.6	0.6	11.4	43.9	3.0	0.8	1.8	6.9	2.0	100

CHI SQUARE = 54.20238 WITH 24 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0004

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 87

TABLE 68. NATIONAL MEDIA USE BY ETHNICITY

ETHNIC	NTLMEDIA	1. NEWSPAPERS	2. MAGAZINES	3. RADIO	4. TELEVISION	5. FRIENDS	6. OTHER	7. RADIO AND TV	8. NEWSPAPER & TV	9. NO RESPONSE	ROW TOTAL
1. ANGLO	COUNT	178	42	42	476	6	8	14	62	16	844
	ROW %	21.1	5.0	5.0	56.4	0.7	0.9	1.7	7.3	1.9	64.1
	COL %	62.7	72.4	39.6	66.7	46.2	80.0	66.7	72.9	64.0	
	TOTAL %	13.5	3.2	3.2	36.2	0.5	0.6	1.1	4.7	1.2	
2. MEX-AMERICAN	COUNT	106	16	64	238	7	2	7	23	9	472
	ROW %	22.5	3.4	13.6	50.4	1.5	0.4	1.5	4.9	1.9	35.9
	COL %	37.3	27.6	60.4	33.3	53.8	20.0	33.3	27.1	36.0	
	TOTAL %	8.1	1.2	4.9	18.1	0.5	0.2	0.5	1.7	0.7	
COLUMN TOTAL		284	58	106	714	13	10	21	85	25	1316
		21.6	4.4	8.1	54.3	1.0	0.8	1.6	6.5	1.9	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 37.51507 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0002

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 53

TABLE 69. STATE MEDIA USE BY ETHNICITY

ETHNIC	COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %	SMEDIA: NEWSPAPERS 1.	MAGAZINES 2.	RADIO 3.	TELEVISION 4.	FRIENDS 5.	OTHER 6.	RADIO AND TV 7.	NEWSPAPER & TV 8.	NO RESPONSE 9.	ROW TOTAL
ANGLO	1.	272	10	50	402	10	6	18	68	22	856
		31.8	1.2	5.8	47.0	1.2	0.7	2.1	7.7	2.6	64.2
		68.7	50.0	41.3	64.3	66.7	50.0	72.0	74.2	73.3	
		20.4	0.8	3.8	30.2	0.8	0.5	1.4	5.0	1.7	
MEX-AMERICAN	2.	124	10	71	223	5	6	7	23	8	477
		26.0	2.1	14.9	46.8	1.0	1.3	1.5	4.8	1.7	35.8
		31.3	50.0	58.7	35.7	33.3	50.0	28.0	25.8	26.7	
		9.3	0.8	5.3	16.7	0.4	0.5	1.7	8.6	0.6	
	COLUMN TOTAL	396	20	121	625	15	12	25	89	30	1333
		29.7	1.5	9.1	46.9	1.1	0.9	1.9	6.7	2.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 39.47179 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 36

TABLE 70. LOCAL MEDIA USE BY ETHNICITY

ETHNIC	LMEDIA	1. NEWSPAPERS	2. MAGAZINES	3. RADIO	4. TELEVISION	5. FRIENDS	6. OTHER	7. RADIO AND TV	8. NEWSPAPER & TV	9. NO RESPONSE	ROW TOTAL
1. ANGLO	COUNT	284	6	60	379	22	5	16	70	20	894
	ROW %	33.3	0.7	7.0	43.3	2.6	0.7	1.9	8.2	2.3	64.2
	COL %	71.4	75.0	39.7	63.5	57.9	60.0	69.6	73.7	80.0	
	TOTAL %	21.3	0.5	4.5	27.8	1.7	0.5	1.2	5.3	1.5	
2. MEX-AMERICAN	COUNT	114	2	91	213	16	4	7	25	5	477
	ROW %	23.9	0.4	19.1	44.7	3.4	0.8	1.5	5.2	1.0	35.8
	COL %	28.6	25.7	60.3	36.5	42.1	40.4	30.4	26.3	20.0	
	TOTAL %	8.6	0.2	6.8	16.0	1.2	0.3	0.5	1.9	0.4	
	COLUMN TOTAL	398	8	151	583	38	10	23	95	25	1331
		29.9	0.6	11.3	43.8	2.9	0.8	1.7	7.1	1.9	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 56.18411 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 36

TABLE 71. NATIONAL MEDIA USE BY SES

SES	NTLMEDIA	NEWSPAPERS	MAGAZINES	RADIO	TELEVISION	FRIENDS	OTHER	RADIO AND TV	NEWSPAPER & TV	NO RESPONSE	ROW TOTAL
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	
LOW	1.	70	9	59	188	2	5	2	20	6	361
		19.4	2.5	16.3	52.1	0.6	1.4	0.6	5.5	1.7	27.4
		24.6	15.5	55.7	26.3	15.4	50.0	9.5	23.5	24.0	
		5.3	0.7	4.5	14.3	0.2	0.4	0.2	1.5	0.5	
MIDDLE	2.	120	13	28	322	5	0	18	43	9	558
		21.5	2.3	5.0	57.7	0.9	0.0	3.2	7.7	1.6	42.4
		42.3	22.4	26.4	45.1	38.5	0.0	85.7	50.6	36.0	
		9.1	1.0	2.1	24.5	0.4	0.0	1.4	3.3	0.7	
HIGH	3.	94	36	19	204	6	5	1	22	10	397
		23.7	9.1	4.8	51.4	1.5	1.3	0.3	5.5	2.5	30.2
		33.1	62.1	17.9	28.6	46.2	50.0	4.8	25.9	40.0	
		7.1	2.7	1.4	15.5	0.5	0.4	0.1	1.7	0.8	
COLUMN TOTAL		284	58	106	714	13	10	21	85	25	1316
		21.6	4.4	8.1	54.3	1.0	0.8	1.6	6.5	1.9	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 103.19561 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 53

TABLE 72. STATE MEDIA USE BY SES

SES	SMEDIA	1. NEWSPAPERS	2. MAGAZINES	3. RADIO	4. TELEVISION	5. FRIENDS	6. OTHER	7. RADIO AND TV	8. NEWSPAPER & TV	9. NO RESPONSE	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1. COUNT	84	6	54	180	6	4	2	16	8	362
	ROW %	23.2	1.7	14.9	49.7	1.7	1.1	0.6	5.0	2.2	27.2
	COL %	21.2	30.0	44.6	28.8	40.0	33.3	8.0	20.2	26.7	
	TOTAL %	6.3	0.5	4.1	13.5	0.5	0.3	0.2	1.4	0.6	
MIDDLE	2. COUNT	166	5	43	268	6	4	20	44	8	564
	ROW %	29.4	0.9	7.6	47.5	1.1	0.7	3.5	7.8	1.4	42.3
	COL %	41.9	25.0	35.5	42.9	40.0	33.3	80.0	49.4	26.7	
	TOTAL %	12.5	0.4	3.2	20.1	0.5	0.3	1.5	3.3	0.6	
HIGH	3. COUNT	146	9	24	177	3	4	3	27	14	407
	ROW %	35.9	2.2	5.9	43.5	0.7	1.0	0.7	6.6	3.4	30.5
	COL %	36.9	45.0	19.8	28.3	20.0	33.3	12.0	30.3	46.7	
	TOTAL %	11.0	0.7	1.8	13.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	2.0	1.1	
	COLUMN TOTAL	396	20	121	625	15	12	25	89	30	1333
		29.7	1.5	9.1	46.9	1.1	0.9	1.9	6.7	2.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 57.76782 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 36

TABLE 72. STATE MEDIA USE BY SES

SES	SMEDIA	NEWSPAPERS 1.	MAGAZINES 2.	RADIO 3.	TELEVISION 4.	FRIENDS 5.	OTHER 6.	RADIO AND TV 7.	NEWSPAPER & TV 8.	NO RESPONSE 9.	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1. COUNT	84	6	54	180	6	4	2	16	8	362
	ROW %	23.2	1.7	14.9	49.7	1.7	1.1	0.6	5.0	2.2	27.2
	COL %	21.2	30.0	44.6	28.8	40.0	33.3	8.0	20.2	26.7	
	TOTAL %	6.3	0.5	4.1	13.5	0.5	0.3	0.2	1.4	0.6	
MIDDLE	2. COUNT	166	5	43	268	6	4	20	44	8	564
	ROW %	29.4	0.9	7.6	47.5	1.1	0.7	3.5	7.8	1.4	42.3
	COL %	41.9	25.0	35.5	42.9	40.0	33.3	80.0	49.4	26.7	
	TOTAL %	12.5	0.4	3.2	20.1	0.5	0.3	1.5	3.3	0.6	
HIGH	3. COUNT	146	9	24	177	3	4	3	27	14	407
	ROW %	35.9	2.2	5.9	43.5	0.7	1.0	0.7	6.6	3.4	30.5
	COL %	36.9	45.0	19.8	28.3	20.0	33.3	12.0	30.3	46.7	
	TOTAL %	11.0	0.7	1.8	13.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	2.0	1.1	
COLUMN TOTAL		396	20	121	625	15	12	25	89	30	1333
		29.7	1.5	9.1	46.9	1.1	0.9	1.9	6.7	2.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 57.76782 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 36

TABLE 73. LOCAL MEDIA USE BY SES

SES	COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %	LMEDIA: NEWSPAPERS 1.	MAGAZINES 2.	RADIO 3.	TELEVISION 4.	FRIENDS 5.	OTHER 6.	RADIO AND TV 7.	NEWSPAPER & TV 8.	NO RESPONSE 9.	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	90	4	75	146	10	2	1	24	8	360
		25.0	1.1	20.8	40.6	2.8	0.6	0.3	6.7	2.2	27.0
		22.6	50.0	49.7	25.0	26.3	20.0	4.3	25.3	32.0	
		6.8	0.3	5.6	11.0	0.8	0.2	0.1	1.8	0.6	
MIDDLE	2.	167	0	52	268	9	3	15	46	7	567
		29.5	0.0	9.2	47.3	1.6	0.5	2.6	8.1	1.2	42.6
		42.0	0.0	34.4	46.0	23.7	30.0	65.2	48.4	28.0	
		12.5	0.0	3.9	20.1	0.7	0.2	1.1	3.5	0.5	
HIGH	3.	141	4	24	169	19	5	7	25	10	404
		34.9	1.0	5.9	41.8	4.7	1.2	1.7	6.2	2.5	30.4
		35.4	50.0	15.9	29.0	50.0	50.0	30.4	26.3	40.0	
		10.6	0.3	1.8	12.7	1.4	0.4	0.5	1.9	0.8	
COLUMN TOTAL		398	8	151	583	38	10	23	95	25	1331
		29.9	0.6	11.3	43.8	2.9	0.8	1.7	7.1	1.9	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 77.02519 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 38

TABLE 74. MEDIA ACCURACY BY AREA

AREA	ACCINFO / COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %	1. NEWSPAPERS	2. MAGAZINES	3. RADIO	4. TV	5. OTHER	6. NONE	7. NEWSPAPER&TV	9. NO RESPONSE	ROW TOTAL
	0.	29	12	14	55	1	27	0	4	142
		20.4	8.5	9.9	38.7	0.7	19.0	0.0	2.8	10.8
		10.8	12.8	10.1	9.8	5.6	14.0	0.0	9.3	
		2.2	0.9	1.1	4.2	0.1	2.1	0.0	0.3	
CENTER CITY	1.	177	56	84	358	12	118	2	24	831
		21.3	6.7	10.1	43.1	1.4	14.2	0.2	2.9	63.1
		63.8	59.6	60.9	64.0	66.7	61.1	66.7	55.8	
		13.4	4.3	6.4	27.2	0.9	9.0	0.2	1.8	
SUBURBAN	3.	18	14	10	41	2	26	0	2	111
		16.2	12.6	9.0	36.9	0.2	23.4	0.0	1.8	8.4
		6.7	14.9	7.2	7.3	0.6	13.5	0.0	4.7	
		1.4	1.1	0.8	3.1	0.2	2.0	0.0	0.2	
RURAL	4.	45	12	30	105	5	22	1	13	233
		19.3	5.2	12.9	45.1	2.1	9.4	0.4	5.6	17.7
		16.7	12.8	21.7	18.8	27.8	11.4	33.3	30.2	
		3.4	0.9	2.3	8.0	0.4	1.7	0.1	1.0	
	COLUMN TOTAL	269	94	138	559	18	193	3	43	1317
		20.4	7.1	10.5	42.4	1.4	14.7	0.2	3.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 32.41953 WITH 21 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0531

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 52

TABLE 75. MEDIA ACCURACY BY ETHNICITY

ETHNIC	ACCINFO	1. NEWSPAPERS	2. MAGAZINES	3. RADIO	4. TV	5. OTHER	6. NONE	7. NEWSPAPER&TV	9. NO RESPONSE	ROW TOTAL
1. ANGLO	COUNT	176	72	76	354	10	170	2	18	878
	ROW %	20.0	8.2	8.7	40.3	1.1	19.4	0.2	2.1	64.2
	COL %	63.3	74.2	52.8	60.8	52.6	85.4	66.7	40.9	
	TOTAL %	12.9	5.3	5.6	25.9	0.7	12.4	0.1	1.3	
2. MEX-AMERICAN	COUNT	102	25	68	228	10	29	1	26	489
	ROW %	20.9	5.1	13.9	46.6	2.0	5.9	0.2	5.3	35.8
	COL %	36.7	25.8	47.2	39.2	50.0	14.6	33.3	59.1	
	TOTAL %	7.5	1.8	5.0	16.7	0.7	2.1	0.1	1.9	
COLUMN TOTAL		278	97	144	582	20	199	3	44	1367
		20.3	7.1	10.5	42.6	1.5	14.6	0.2	3.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 66.58218 WITH 7 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 2

TABLE 76. MEDIA ACCURACY BY SES

SES	ACCINFO	1. NEWSPAPERS	2. MAGAZINES	3. RADIO	4. TV	5. OTHER	6. NONE	7. NEWSPAPER&TV	9. NO RESPONSE	ROW TOTAL
1. LOW	COUNT	79	13	48	176	6	27	3	20	372
	ROW %	21.2	3.5	12.9	47.3	1.6	7.3	0.8	5.4	27.2
	COL %	28.4	13.4	33.3	30.2	30.0	13.6	100.0	45.5	
	TOTAL %	5.8	1.0	3.5	12.9	0.4	2.0	0.2	1.5	
2. MIDDLE	COUNT	125	35	62	271	6	67	0	16	582
	ROW %	21.5	6.0	10.7	46.6	1.0	11.5	0.0	2.7	42.6
	COL %	45.0	36.1	43.1	46.6	30.0	33.7	0.0	36.4	
	TOTAL %	9.1	2.6	4.5	19.8	0.4	4.9	0.0	1.2	
3. HIGH	COUNT	74	49	34	135	8	105	0	8	413
	ROW %	17.9	11.9	8.2	32.7	1.9	25.4	0.0	1.9	30.2
	COL %	26.6	50.5	23.6	23.2	40.0	52.8	0.0	18.2	
	TOTAL %	5.4	3.6	2.5	9.9	0.6	7.7	0.0	0.6	
COLUMN TOTAL		278	97	144	582	20	199	3	44	1367
		20.3	7.1	10.5	42.6	1.5	14.6	0.2	3.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 108.55575 WITH 14 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 2

TABLE 77. READ ENVIRONMENTAL STORY BY AREA.

AREA	READST: COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %	1. READ -TAKES PAPER	2. TAKES-DON'T READ	3. DNT-DIDN'T READ	4. NOT READ	9. NO RESP	ROW TOTAL
	0.	77	39	22	4	0	142
		54.2	27.5	15.5	2.8	0.0	10.8
		14.7	34.8	5.2	1.7	0.0	
		5.8	3.0	1.7	0.3	0.0	
CENTER CITY	1.	320	43	297	155	16	831
		38.5	5.2	35.7	18.7	1.9	63.1
		61.0	38.4	69.6	66.8	76.2	
		24.3	3.3	22.6	11.8	1.2	
SUBURBAN	3.	58	22	25	6	0	111
		52.3	19.8	22.5	5.4	0.0	8.4
		11.0	19.6	5.9	2.6	0.0	
		4.4	1.7	1.9	0.5	0.0	
RURAL	4.	70	8	83	67	5	233
		30.0	3.4	35.6	28.8	2.1	17.7
		13.3	7.1	19.4	28.9	23.8	
		5.3	0.6	6.3	5.1	0.4	
	COLUMN TOTAL	525	112	427	232	21	1317
		39.9	8.5	32.4	17.6	1.6	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 180.74382 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 52

TABLE 78. SAW TV ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT BY AREA

AREA	TVSTO: SAW STOR 1.	DIDN'T SEE 2.	3.	4.	NO RESP 9.	ROW TOTAL
0.	61	67	13	0	1	142
	43.0	47.2	9.2	0.0	0.7	10.8
	10.1	10.3	36.1	0.0	4.2	
	4.6	5.1	1.0	0.0	0.1	
1. CENTER CITY	394	409	10	0	18	831
	47.4	49.2	1.2	0.0	2.2	63.1
	65.2	62.7	27.8	0.0	75.0	
	29.9	31.1	0.8	0.0	1.4	
3. SUBURBAN	62	38	11	0	0	111
	55.9	34.2	9.9	0.0	0.0	8.4
	10.3	5.8	30.6	0.0	0.0	
	4.7	2.9	0.8	0.0	0.0	
4. RURAL	87	138	2	1	5	233
	37.3	59.2	0.9	0.4	2.1	17.7
	14.4	21.2	5.6	100.0	20.8	
	6.6	10.5	0.2	0.1	0.4	
COLUMN TOTAL	604	652	36	1	24	1317
	45.9	49.5	2.7	0.1	1.8	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 77.42144 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = -0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 52

TABLE 79. READ ENVIRONMENTAL STORY BY ETHNICITY

ETHNIC	READST	1. READ-TAKES PAPER	2. READ-DOE SN'T TAK	3. TAKES-DI DN'T REA	4. DNT-DID NOT READ	9. NO RESP	ROW TOTAL
ANGLO	1.	388	96	286	96	12	878
		44.2	10.9	32.6	10.9	1.4	64.2
		71.2	83.5	64.0	40.2	57.1	
		28.4	7.0	20.9	7.0	0.9	
MEX-AMERICAN	2.	157	19	161	143	9	489
		32.1	3.9	32.9	29.2	1.8	35.8
		28.8	16.5	36.0	59.8	42.9	
		11.5	1.4	11.8	10.5	0.7	
COLUMN TOTAL		545	115	447	239	21	1367
		39.9	8.4	32.7	17.5	1.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 90.74576 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 2

TABLE 80. SAW TV ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT BY ETHNICITY

ETHNIC	TVSTO	1.	2.	3.	4.	9.	ROW TOTAL
1. ANGLO	COUNT	410	422	30	0	16	878
	ROW %	46.7	48.1	3.4	0.0	1.8	64.2
	COL %	65.8	61.9	83.3	0.0	64.0	
	TOTAL %	30.0	30.9	2.2	0.0	1.2	
2. MEX-AMERICAN	COUNT	213	260	6	1	9	489
	ROW %	43.6	53.2	1.2	0.2	1.8	35.8
	COL %	34.2	38.1	16.7	100.0	36.0	
	TOTAL %	15.6	19.0	0.4	0.1	0.7	
COLUMN TOTAL		623	682	36	1	25	1367
		45.6	49.9	2.6	0.1	1.8	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 9.83544 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0433

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 2

TABLE 81. READ ENVIRONMENTAL STORY BY SES.

SES	COUNT / ROW % / COL % / TOTAL %	READST 1. READ-TAK ES PAPER	2. READ-DOE SN'T TAK	3. TAKES-DI ON'T REA	4. ONT-DID NOT READ	9. NO RESP	ROW TOTAL
LOW	1.	95	20	116	133	8	372
		25.5	5.4	31.2	35.8	2.2	27.2
		17.4	17.4	26.0	55.6	38.1	
		6.9	1.5	8.5	9.7	2.6	
MIDDLE	2.	243	53	214	66	6	582
		41.8	9.1	36.8	11.3	1.0	42.6
		44.6	46.1	47.9	27.6	28.6	
		17.8	3.9	15.7	4.8	2.4	
HIGH	3.	207	42	117	40	7	413
		50.1	10.2	28.3	9.7	1.7	30.2
		38.0	36.5	26.2	16.7	33.3	
		15.1	3.1	8.6	2.9	2.5	
	COLUMN TOTAL	545	115	447	239	21	1367
		39.9	8.4	32.7	17.5	1.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 112.81025 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 2

TABLE 82. SAW TV ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT BY SES

SES	TVSTO: SAW STORY DIDN'T SEE 1.	2.	3.	4.	NO RESP 9.	ROW TOTAL
LOW 1.	143	216	7	0	6	372
	38.4	58.1	1.9	0.0	1.6	27.2
	23.0	31.7	19.4	0.0	24.0	
	10.5	15.8	0.5	0.0	0.4	
MIDDLE 2.	257	303	11	1	10	582
	44.2	52.1	1.9	0.2	1.7	42.6
	41.3	44.4	30.6	100.0	40.0	
	18.8	22.2	0.8	0.1	0.7	
HIGH 3.	223	163	18	0	9	413
	54.0	39.5	4.4	0.0	2.2	30.2
	35.8	23.9	50.0	0.0	36.0	
	16.3	11.9	1.3	0.0	0.7	
COLUMN TOTAL	623	682	36	1	25	1367
	45.6	49.9	2.6	0.1	1.8	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 33.80672 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 2

SECTION 8

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS

In one sense, the ultimate goal of this research project is to understand the why's and who's of environmental attitudes. The previous sections have attempted to identify these attitudes from survey data. In this section, we turn to a different, and more powerful technique of analysis: multivariate analysis--specifically regression and factor analysis.

Multiple regression attempts to "predict" the dependent variable. In this case, we set variable IMPTPBSI (rating environmental problems as the most important) as the dependent variable. We then include the following list of independent variables:

INCOME	
AREA	(Center city/non-center city)
SES	(Socioeconomic status)
WORKING	(Employment status)
CARS	(Ownership of automobiles)
HEALTH	(State of respondents' health)
WCHORG	(Membership in environmental organization)
MSTCONT	(Industry as most contributing to pollution)
ATTMEET	(Having attended environmental meeting)
AUTOEX	(Willingness to spend above average to reduce auto emissions)
CNTH2O	(Willingness to spend above average to reduce water pollution)
RNOISE	(Willingness to spend above average to reduce noise)
TSH	(Willingness to spend above average to reduce trash problems)
INEWREC	(Willingness to spend above average to provide more recreation)

The data were dichotomized into presence/absence of the variable where necessary to allow us to treat them as interval data, suitable for use in multivariate analysis.

REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Our first analysis consisted of a stepwise multiple regression with IMPTPBSI set as the dependent variable. The results are given in the following summary table (Table 83). The most important aspect of Table 83 is the column noted R SQUARE. This noted the amount of variance in the dependent variable (IMPTPBSI) accounted for by each succeeding step in the regression equation. As can be noted, willingness to spend above average in investing in additional recreational facilities entered the equation first and accounts for almost 9% of the variance in the dependent variable. No other variable

accounted for as much as 4% additional explanation of variance. The total amount of variance explained by the 16 steps in the regression equation is approximately 35%.

The column named BETA in Table 83 is also significant. BETA indicates the relationship between the dependent variable and the named independent variable. As can be seen, the BETA's for the first independent variable is both negative and fairly large. This indicates that there is a fairly strong inverse relationship between this variable (INEWREC) and the dependent variable (IMPTPBSI). In other words, as the willingness to spend above average to invest in additional recreational water facilities increases, ranking of environmental problems as the most important problem declines.

The expected high relationship between income and high SES on the one hand and willingness to rate environmental problems as the most important is not borne out by this data. INCOME enters the equation on step 14 and only explains an additional 0.1%, a very small figure. SES adds even less. The BETA's for both income and SES are quite small, and income is positive, while SES is negative.

FACTOR ANALYSIS

This section presents the results of an additional multivariative technique--factor analysis. One of the best uses of this technique is the identification of an underlying pattern or factor which is related to the variables under study. Factor analysis manipulates the variables so as to disclose patterns of relationships, if any, extant among them. In essence, a variable's factor loading can be taken as the correlation between that variable and the underlying factor which underpins the data. We present this analysis as a companion to the regression analysis presented above.

The factoring procedure used in this case is the Principal Factor with Iterations (PA2) for the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. The results of the factor analysis are shown in Table 84. Using an eigenvalue of 1.0 as a criterion level, we see four factors emerge, accounting for 74.7% of the variance.

Factor One accounts for 29% of the variance, and is distinguished by high loadings of four of the willingness to spend above average for environmental quality variables. As a result, we have identified this factor as Environmental Quality. The only item of expenditures which does not load on this factor is INEWREC, willingness to spend above average on new recreational facilities. Additionally, there is a relatively high loading of the variable CARS, ownership of an automobile (.43 loading).

Factor Two accounts for an additional 20% of the variance. It is characterized by very high loadings of the SES and INCOME variables. Accordingly, it has been identified as the "high status" factor. There are modest negative loadings of ETHNIC (Mexican-American ethnicity) and willingness to spend for new recreational facilities (INEWREC). The negative loading of INEWREC) on this factor aids in confirming the pattern of data reported earlier.

Factor Three accounts for an additional 13.3% of the variance and is characterized by a high loading of the variable AREA (non-center city). A slight negative loading of unemployment (WORKING) is also featured on this factor. The ATTMEET variable loads at a moderate negative level on this factor. We have characterized this factor as "Suburban/Rural."

The final factor which emerges accounts for an additional 12.4% of the variance. We have entitled Factor Four as the anti-industry variable from its high loading of MSTCONT variable. Also loading very high on this factor is the SEX variable (female).

The factor analysis thus helps to confirm the general patterning of data reported earlier. The most significant finding of the factor analysis is the large relatively consistent loading that four of the willingness to spend for environmental quality variables have on the first factor. The major exception was spending for new recreational facilities.

TABLE 83. SUMMARY TABLE: RESULTS FROM MULTIPLE REGRESSION

THE UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH, SPSS*10, RELEASE 7.01 (24-NOV-77)
FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 14 MAY-78) 14*MAY-78 PAGE 17

• • • •

TABLE 84. SUMMARY TABLE: RESULTS FROM FACTOR ANALYSIS

VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5	FACTOR 6	FACTOR 7
IMPTPBS1	0.84589	0.45242	0.72965	-0.07075	-0.14225	-0.03879	-0.09719
INCOME	0.93852	0.04117	-0.01392	0.05142	0.09061	-0.02646	0.09194
AREA	-0.01647	0.12208	-0.42253	0.15542	0.02043	0.62770	0.00884
SES	0.91726	-0.10584	0.21384	0.00687	0.10354	0.05315	0.03305
ETHNIC	-0.24042	0.18842	-0.78753	-0.07622	-0.00625	0.12682	-0.04616
HEALTH	-0.22891	0.42976	-0.03696	-0.34027	0.37665	-0.16515	0.37839
WCHORG	-0.27429	0.13954	0.48773	-0.26135	0.42875	-0.17633	0.01058
MSTCONT	0.01787	0.63205	0.07006	-0.22277	-0.01960	0.14766	0.10739
ATTMEET	-0.03368	0.22245	0.07427	0.16872	-0.02460	-0.73292	0.19554
AUTOEX	0.04181	-0.06364	-0.10042	0.89114	0.02063	-0.01742	0.09342
CNTH2O	0.09591	-0.71038	0.07382	-0.06898	0.00621	0.21220	0.18038
RNOISE	0.01117	-0.24124	0.12239	0.54273	0.51467	0.05544	-0.16469
WORKNG	-0.26901	0.03533	0.04855	-0.06712	-0.67577	-0.00427	-0.00966
CARS	0.01218	0.06291	0.14551	0.28088	-0.13119	0.53277	0.52998
TSH	-0.02705	-0.58411	-0.11266	0.02609	0.50901	0.05719	-0.02720
INEWREC	-0.13204	0.07445	0.05931	0.01707	0.00296	0.14053	-0.87859

TRANSFORMATION MATRIX

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5	FACTOR 6	FACTOR 7
FACTOR 1	0.49125	-0.63906	-0.18660	0.44197	0.21910	0.26818	0.01422
FACTOR 2	0.62276	0.14122	0.66876	-0.07875	0.12928	-0.32196	0.13571
FACTOR 3	0.42634	0.42398	-0.27377	0.00346	-0.48860	0.41123	0.39464
FACTOR 4	-0.12200	0.03812	-0.26693	-0.05958	0.50779	-0.22912	0.77364
FACTOR 5	-0.26619	0.11406	0.22027	0.83021	-0.28202	-0.23617	0.20750
FACTOR 6	0.24150	0.55813	-0.39148	0.29765	0.41176	-0.18904	-0.42782
FACTOR 7	-0.21219	0.25691	0.41226	0.13059	0.43545	0.71506	0.03214

SECTION 9

CONCLUSIONS

What does all this mean? We noted in our introductory remarks that previous studies have provided us with information relating to environmental attitudes (see above, p. 2). These studies have indicated that a significant portion of the American community are aware of and concerned about the problems of a deteriorating environment, but the most recent studies (Dunlap, 1976; Buttel, 1974) have noted a decline in this public concern. Studies have indicated generally that people with higher SES levels are more sensitive to environmental problems and are more willing to act, or support action, to improve environmental conditions. Other studies have contended that: Americans believe the environment is deteriorating; Americans view environmental problems primarily in terms of water and air pollution; and most Americans rely on television and radio for information relating to environmental quality.

Our data support some of the above findings and do not support some of them. We do find, as recent studies have reported, much less interest in environmental problems than evidenced in 1960's and early 1970's. Fewer than three hundred respondents listed the environment among the three most important problems facing the nation.

We find also a relationship between SES and concern with the environment. The percentage of respondents in the high SES level who ranked environmental problems as most important is over twice that of the low SES respondents. Upper and middle level SES respondents generally were more aware of organizations dealing with environmental problems and had contacted public officials more frequently about environmental issues.

Our data support the belief that Americans view the environment as deteriorating. While about half of the respondents characterized present environmental conditions as "above average" and only one-fifth characterized it as "below average," when asked to predict environmental conditions five years hence, almost half believed the environment would be "below average" and only one-third believed it would be "above average."

Previous studies indicate that we view environmental problems primarily in terms of air and water pollution. Our study takes issue with the former contention. We found that our respondents identified the environment overwhelmingly in terms of both physical and social characteristics. It is noteworthy that the one environmental issue which stimulated the greatest cost response was the need for recreational areas (this response cut across

areas, ethnic, and SES groupings), a problem area related to both physical and social concepts. We also found strong responses to water pollution, but not to air pollution.

Previous studies also have noted that Americans derive most of their information relating to environmental issues from television and radio. Our research supports those studies which cite television as a major source. Not only did our respondents indicate that television was the primary news source, they also believed it to be the most accurate and unbiased news source. We found, however, that newspapers rather than radio, were the second most frequently cited information source.

In addition to these data which can be compared to existing studies, we have findings which themselves need to be tested by further inquiry.

We have suggestions of significant relationships between environmental attitudes and area, ethnicity, and SES. Our research indicates that concern with environmental problems decreases slightly as one moves away from the center city to the rural areas. Suburban residents also viewed the condition of the environment, both present and future, in more optimistic terms than respondents residing in the center city or rural areas. Rural residents are more pessimistic than center city and suburban residents about the future. This is somewhat of a surprise as one might hypothesize that those living closest to a deteriorating environment (i.e., inner city) would be more pessimistic about its future rather than those living in the areas (i.e., rural) where there is less pollution. In general, we found suburban respondents to be more actively involved with the environment than the other two area respondents.

Environmental studies often seemed to be a function of ethnicity. Mexican-Americans ranked environmental concerns slightly higher than Anglos. Mexican-Americans also perceived present and future environmental conditions in more pessimistic terms than Anglos. This concern and pessimism did not translate into political activism; more than twice as many Anglos as Mexican-Americans are members of organizations with an environmental orientation, and Anglos evidenced more knowledge of and activism in both public and private groups focusing on the environment.

Environmental attitudes also were influenced by the SES of respondents. While higher SES respondents seemed to be more aware of environmental problems, they also were more positive about present and future environmental conditions. Lower SES respondents were more pessimistic about the environmental conditions. Higher SES respondents seemed more interested in water pollution and less interested in recreation than the other groups. As has been indicated by various studies of political socialization, higher SES respondents were more knowledgeable about organizations which were involved with environmental problems and were more active than other respondents in dealing with these problems.

We have attempted in this study to add to the growing literature of environmental attitudes. The attitudes of our San Antonio sample indicate that concern for the environment is not a highly salient feature of their

attitudinal environment. Economic concerns, either unemployment or the state of the economy, virtually dominated the rankings of important public problems.

Of course, policy preferences of the public are not divorced from external influence. Our survey was conducted during a period of relative calm where environmental issues are concerned. The energy crisis of the early 1970's had dimmed and San Antonioans would not be immersed in their conflict over fuel supply for several months. Had our study been conducted a few months earlier or a few months later, our data might have generated different conclusions. However, this is a caveat which must accompany any study attempting to ascertain public opinion on a popular issue.

In sum, the environmental movement, as suggested by both Dunlap and Downs (Dunlap, 1975; Downs, 1972), seems to have gone aground on the rocky shoals of more immediate, pressing concerns--economic. While Buttel and Flynn may well be correct in their assessment that there is no inherent gross incompatibility between economic growth and environmental quality, it is apparent from our data that environmental concern is being pushed aside. As Springer and Costantini noted, "Currently, environmental concern appears more as a national wish than a hard political commitment. The growth and extent of this commitment, and the lines of political combat, will become clearer as the costs and benefits of environmental policy become more evident to decision-makers and the public." (Springer and Costantini, 1974: 217). Our data leads us to suggest that the "hard political commitment" is not likely to be forthcoming.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Banfield, Edward. 1970. The Unheavenly City. (Boston: Little Brown).

Bartell, Ted. 1973. "Political Orientations and Public Response to the Energy Crisis." Social Science Quarterly 57 (September).

Buttel, Frederick. 1976. "Social Science and the Environment: Competing Theories." Social Science Quarterly 57 (September).

Council on Environmental Quality. 1975. Environmental Quality, 1975. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office).

Crenson, Matthew. 1971. The Un-Politics of Air Pollution: A Study of Non-Decisionmaking in the Cities. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins).

Davies, J. Clarence, and Davies, Barbara S. 1975. The Politics of Pollution (2d ed.). Indianapolis: Pegusus.

Downs, Anthony. 1972. "Up and Down with Ecology." The Public Interest 28 (Summer).

Dunlap, Riley. 1976. "Decline in Public Support for Environmental Protection: Evidence from a 1970-74 Panel Study." Rural Sociology.

Gallup Organization, Inc. 1972. "The U.S. Public Considers Its Environment: Survey II." Poll conducted for the National Wildlife Federation (January).

Garvey, Gerald. 1972. Energy, Ecology, Economy. (New York: Norton).

Harris, Louis and Associates, Inc. 1970. The Public View of Environmental Problems in the State of Washington.

Jones, Charles O. 1975. Clean Air: The Politics and Policies of Pollution Control. (Pittsburgh: U. of Pittsburgh Press).

Kneese, Allen V. and Schultze, Charles L. 1975. Pollution, Prices and Public Policy. (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution).

McEvoy, James III. 1971. The American Public's Concern With the Environment: A Study of Public Opinion. (Davis, California: U. of California, Davis).

Rosenbaum, Walter. 1973. The Politics of Environmental Concern. (New York: Praeger).

Simon, Rita. 1971. "Public Attitudes Toward Population and Pollution." Public Opinion Quarterly 35 (Spring).

Springer, J. Fred and Constantini, Edward. 1974. "Public Opinion and the Environment: An Issue in Search of a Home," in Stuart Nagel, ed., Environmental Politics. (New York: Praeger).

Straayer, John A. 1974. "A Note of Environmental Caution," unpublished manuscript, Colorado State University.

Tognacci, L.N., et al. 1972. "Environmental Quality: How Universal is Public Concern?" Environment and Behavior 4 (March).

Viladas, J.M. 1973. The American People and Their Environment. (Greenwich, Conn.: J.M. Viladas Co.).

_____. 1973. "The American Public Considers Its Environment," report prepared for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

_____. 1974. "The Impact of the Fuel Shortage on Public Attitudes Toward the Environment," report for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Wenner, Lettie. 1976. One Environment Under Law: A Public Policy Dilemma. (Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear).